Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Geomorphology

Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: GEOMOR-6971R1

Title: Dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes: a review

Article Type: Invited Review

Keywords: salt marsh; Wetlands; hurricanes; storms

Corresponding Author: Dr. Nicoletta Leonardi, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution:

First Author: Nicoletta Leonardi, PhD

Order of Authors: Nicoletta Leonardi, PhD; Iacopo Carnacina; Carmine Donatelli; Neil Kamal Ganju; Andrew James Plater; Mark Schuerch; Stijn Temmerman

Abstract: This manuscript reviews the progresses made in the understanding of the dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes, including the dissipation of extreme water levels and wind waves across marsh surfaces, the geomorphic impact of storms on salt marshes, the preservation of hurricanes signals and deposits into the sedimentary records, and the importance of storms for the long term survival of salt marshes to sea level rise. A review of weaknesses, and strengths of coastal defences incorporating the use of salt marshes including natural, and hybrid infrastructures in comparison to standard built solutions is then presented.

Salt marshes are effective in dissipating wave energy, and storm surges, especially when the marsh is highly elevated, and continuous. This buffering action reduces for storms lasting more than one day. Storm surge attenuation rates range from 1.7 to 25 cm/km depending on marsh and storms characteristics. In terms of vegetation properties, the more flexible stems tend to flatten during powerful storms, and to dissipate less energy but they are also more resilient to structural damage, and their flattening helps to protect the marsh surface from erosion, while stiff plants tend to break, and could increase the turbulence level and the scour. From a morphological point of view, salt marshes are generally able to withstand violent storms without collapsing, and violent storms are responsible for only a small portion of the long term marsh erosion. Our considerations highlight the necessity to focus on the indirect long term impact that large storms exerts on the whole marsh complex rather than on sole after-storm periods. The morphological consequences of storms, even if not dramatic, might in fact influence the response of the system to normal weather conditions during following inter-storm periods. For instance, storms can cause tidal flats deepening which in turn promotes wave energy propagation, and exerts a long term detrimental effect for marsh boundaries even during calm weather. On the other hand, when a violent storm causes substantial erosion but sediments are redistributed across nearby areas, the long term impact might not be as severe as if sediments were permanently lost from the system, and the salt marsh could easily recover to the initial state.

***Response to Reviewers**

Review of manuscript GEOMOR-6971: "Dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes: a review" by Nicoletta Leonardi, Iacopo Carnacina, Carmine Donatelli, Neil Kamal Ganju, Andrew James Plater, Mark Schuerch, Stijn Temmerman

First of all, we want to thank the editor and reviewers for the constructive comments.
We believe that the manuscript strongly benefitted from them. We addressed all points in the text, and we report a detailed response to each of them below (text in red).

Ms. Ref. No.: GEOMOR-6971
Title: Dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes: a review Geomorphology

Dear Dr. Nicoletta leonardi,

Thanks for your submitting MS 'Dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes: a review' to Geomorphology. Now, I can send you back the review feedback by our 3 reviewers, who did their serious review with comments and suggestions I appended below for your reference. Please note, these reviews were all positive to your paper, believing the value of this review paper. Their recommendation ranges between 'Minor and Major revision'. It is however, although positive they were also proposing many questions and doubts, from different point of view (seeing below), such as missing of updated literatures or some key auguring point of views may not be relevant to the references cited in text, or discussion and conclusion is still unclear. I do agree with the comments in most cases, and understand the extensive literature reviews needed as for a review paper, which will help one build up constructive and farseeing theory at the field of coastal dynamics. In this context, I would recommend that you read all comments carefully and incorporate them into a new version of this paper. Please note, while resubmitting, a letter of reply should be attached in which all review comments and suggestions, whatever agreeing or disagreeing must be responded. This will help rapidly an assessment for the paper quality to be improved towards final acceptance.

Look forward to seeing your new submission.
With my best regards
Zhongyuan Chen
Editor

We have addressed all reviewers' comments in the responses below, as well as in the main text. We added the suggested literature papers, addressed concerns in relation to our arguing points of view, and clarified some parts of the discussion/ conclusion section. Thank you for considering our manuscript for publication in Geomorphology.

Reviewer #1:

The article is an appropriate and timely review of the two way interactions between storms and wetlands. The article organization is appropriate (storm surge reduction, waves attenuation, morphodynamics, long-term evolution with sea level rise). The references cited are exhaustive, even though I suggested a few to add. I do not have major issues. I found some typos and inappropriate terms. I invite the authors to double check every sentence.

We thank the reviewer for the constructive comments, we reported a detailed response to each one of them below, and checked sentences and spelling as recommended.

Comments:
-Deformation. I do not understand what aspect of the storm surge cause an increase in subsidence/compaction. The effective pressure (which, according to Terzaghi's law, determines soil consolidation) does not change with the depth of the water above the marsh (and actually, a marsh

that is inundated has a lower effective pressure than a marsh in which the water table is lower than the bed surface). Is the extra consolidation related to the extra burden caused by the deposition of sediment?
The compaction is associated to the deposition of sediments, and we have now better specified this in the text, at the beginning of the paragraph about deformation:
"….Soil compaction due to sediment layers deposited during storm surges is quite common…"

-Incision vs Erosion. I do not clearly see the logic by which incision should be different than "erosion marsh surface and denudations". For example, I think "plucked marsh should" be in the same category of marsh scaling (which is the in the "erosion marsh surface and denudation"). Especially since these two are caused by the same processes (wave action), they differ only in their spatial scale and geometry.
We understand Reviewer suggestions, and indeed incision and erosion are connected, and frequently arising as a consequence of the same external agents, as we have now specified in the text. However, we decided to keep the distinction between erosion and incision with the main difference between the two being that incision is mostly related to newly formed, and easily identifiable marsh entities which are relatively small with respect to the scale of the entire marsh complex (new scours features across the marsh), while erosion refers to deterioration of existing marsh features (denudation of a large portion of the marsh surface). In the text we added the following:
"Marsh incision, and marsh erosion are strictly related, and the external agents leading to erosion and incision are frequently the same. While being interconnected, the idea of incision is here kept separated from the one of erosion, as it refers to newly formed features, which are small at the scale of the entire marsh complex, while the erosional mechanisms described above and in figure 5 refer to the deterioration of existing, and relatively well-defined marsh components"

Maybe you can divide into "platform erosion" (scalping, ponds, etc) and into "shore erosion" (bank erosion, mudflat deepening). Also, I remember some instances in which scalping (e.g., Priestas 2015, some sites in the Virginia Coast Reserve), when occurring just next to the marsh edge, to be considered shore erosion.
We added the distinction between platform, and shore erosion in figure 5;
Furthermore, we specified in the text that the two can be related: "When root scalping occurs near the marsh edges, this can translate into, or enhance the lateral erosion of the marsh banks (e.g. Priestas et al., 2015)."

Detailed comments:
Line 41. Many coastal areas corrected
Line 190. Huge does not sound the right term we removed "huge", and rephrased as follows: "…where wide marshlands of several tens…"
Line 246-248. Awkward sentence we rephrased as follows:
"The dimension of the tidal channels also influences surge attenuation; for instance, numerical simulations show that the landward flood propagation through the channels is facilitated with deeper or wider channels, leading to less storm surge height reduction (Stark et al., 2016; Temmerman et al., 2012)."
Line 248-253. Very awkward sentence. Not sure what "that exerts…" refers to we removed the sentence
Somewhere in the introduction -> Fagherazzi (2014) makes an interesting point of seeing marshes as a low pass filter for storms (compared to the high pass filter behavior of sandy beaches)
We added the following: "Fagherazzi, 2014, interpreted the bimodal response of vegetated and unvegetated (e.g. sandy beaches) shorelines in terms of low/ high pass filter, suggesting that from a morphological standpoint vegetated shorelines are very effective in buffering (filtering out) very violent storms without damage, but less effective with moderate storms; vice-versa, unvegetated surfaces efficiently absorb energy from mild weather conditions, but generally collapse under high energy. "
Lin3 272. Replace upstream with inland corrected

Line 286. Replace continue with last corrected
Line 297. In this section you can also add the Moeller et al. (2014) study. corrected
Line 594. I don't want to force the authors, but maybe you could consider including this paper that deals exactly with the sediment budget problem (Mariotti and Canestrelli, 2017).
We added the following reference to the paper:
"Mariotti and Canestrelli, 2017 modelled the long term (3000 years) morphodynamic of an idealized tidal basin considering organogenic accretion, and biostabilization; they found that a basin-scale sediment budget is necessary to predict marsh erosion, and that under several conditions, edge erosion, not platform drowning is likely to dominate marsh loss. "

Line 682. Manifold as a noun has a different meaning. Should it be "which is manifold the regular sedimentation"? Or maybe, "which is many times the regular sedimentation" corrected as "which is manifold the regular annual sedimentation…"
Line 691. Typo corrected
Line 719. Elongated is not a great term for time. Maybe long periods corrected
Line 762. "such as during storm surges, even if the wave-bottom interaction and energy dissipation decreases with increasing water level" corrected
Line 798. Here you are doing the classic Wolman and Miller argument. You need to add something like "with increasing water levels, whereas their ability to accrete does not increase much for very high water levels" corrected
Line 834. total wave energy corrected corrected
Line 869. I do not see the greed shaded area in Fig. 8A. the figure caption was corrected green area refers to panel B.
Figure 5. In think you mean "Storm impacts on salt marsh morphology) corrected
Figure 5. I do not fully understand the numbers and units in the boxes. For example, in the shoreline erosion it says 0-m/ m-km. Does it erode zero meters? In how long? (should you include a time scale in every rate unit?) Also, is m-km the horizontal spatial scale of the erosion?
We removed the units
Figure 5. You mean "marsh surface erosion and denudation" corrected
References: Priestas 2015 is not in the reference list. We added the reference

References cited

Möller, I. et al. Wave attenuation over coastal salt marshes under storm surge conditions, Nature Geosci. 7, 727-731 (2014)

Fagherazzi, Sergio, Coastal processes: Storm-proofing with marshes, Nature Geoscience; London 7.10 (Oct 2014): 701-702.

Mariotti G, A Canestrelli, (2017), Long-term morphodynamics of muddy backbarrier basins: Fill in or empty out? JGR- Earth Surface DOI: 10.1002/2017WR020461
http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/2017WR020461/full

We added all the suggested/ missed references.

Reviewer #3:

The authors have made a comprehensive literature review of the role of salt marshes as a coastal protection mechanism.
The recommendations to use hybrid approaches combining continuous marshes with engineered defence structures for coastal protection, is not supported by the literature review. In fact no examples of good engineering practice are given.

Also in the conclusion section engineered defence structures are ignored. The need to look at the long term impact of the whole marsh complex rather than on sole after-storm periods however is an important statement.
The text still needs extra work from the authors to eliminate repetition as much as possible. Also there seems to be little physical interpretation of the literature on wave attenuation. This produces some numbers on wave energy attenuation which are case specific and not generic. Probably the manuscript was submitted under considerable time pressure. While reading the text, I had the impression that at times it was more the addition of items from literature then a fully digested review. Missing references are a sign of this. I indicated a couple of them, but there might be more. Nevertheless this review paper manages to bring together an interesting collection of papers and will be of use for many readers who work in this field. A more digested version, both in terms of more in depth physical interpretation as in terms of more concise writing, will be very much appreciated.

We thank the reviewer for the constructive comments and addressed each one of them below. Generally, in relation to the main concerns illustrated above: i) we removed from the abstract the summary statement recommending the use of hybrid infrastructures, while also providing more material in this regard into the discussion section; ii) we rewrote the section in regard to wave nergy dissipation by vegetation, and added more physically based considerations in regard to the attenuation of wind waves by vegetation stems, as explained in one of the more detailed responses below; iii) Finally, we have revised some parts of the manuscript to improve readability, and avoid repetitions, and checked the reference list.
In regard to the first point, we have added the following considerations in the discussion section:

"Results highlight that there are significant evidences that natural infrastructures such as salt marsh ecosystems, have the potential to enhance coastal resilience. Indeed, in recent years there have been several examples of coastal projects involving natural defences; for instance, in the UK many coastal communities are following manged realignment approaches moving built defences back away from the shoreline to allow natural infrastructures to develop in front of them as a protection (e.g. van Slobbe et al., 2013). In the USA, after hurricane Sandy, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been leading the competition *Rebuild by Design*, which concluded in June 2014 with six winning proposals planning significant hybrid (combined natural, and built defences) components to protect shorelines. Similarly, a project called *PlanNYC* has been developed in New York City for the possible implementation of hybrid coastal protection services (e.g. Sutton-Grier, 2015). Large challenges exist in the identification of best coastal protection options, and there are strengths and weaknesses connected to engineered, as well as natural or hybrid infrastructures (Figure 9). For instance, there is a significant expertise in the design and implementation of built infrastructures, but these provide no co-benefits, can cause habitat losses, and tend to weaken during their life-time. On the other hand, natural infrastructures provide many co-benefits (e.g. carbon sequestration, recreational activities, tourism opportunities), they can strengthen rather than weaken during their lifetime, and possibly adapt to sea level rise; however, they are frequently not ready to be immediately used for coastal protection after their implementation due to the time required for ecosystems establishments, and require large areas to be implemented. Hybrid approaches have the potential to capitalize on best characteristics of both built and natural infrastructures, but can still have some negative impact on the ecosystems with respect to fully natural solutions, and do not provide the same level of co-benefits. We suggest that ideally, coastal protection schemes should rely on a combination of conservation and restoration of large continuous marsh areas when possible, and hybrid solutions where necessary."

A



Built defences

strengths

- Ready to withstand storm events as soon as constructed
- Significant expertise, experience, and good state of knowledge on their implementation and functioning

weaknesses

- Does not adapt with changing conditions (e.g. sea level)
- Possible coastal habitat losses
- False sense of security, possibly causing increased damages during storms
- Only provides storm protection benefits, no co-benefits

B



Natural defences

strengths

- Provides many-co-benefits
- Potential to self-recover after storms
- Can be cheaper
- Potential to adapt changing conditions, and grow stronger in time

weaknesses

- Can take long time before ecosystem is established and ready to provide adequate defence
- Likely require large space
- Growing but still limited expertise in their implementation
- Variable levels of coastal protection depending of the ecosystem, and external forcing, which is possibly difficult to quantify/

C



Hybrid defences

strengths

- Provides some co-benefits
- Can provide greater level confidence than natural solutions alone
- Can be used in areas with smaller space than the required for natural solutions alone
- Capitalize best characteristics of built and natural infrastructures

weaknesses

- Growing but still limited expertise in their implementation
- Does not provide same benefits than natural systems alone
- Can still have some negative impact on the ecosystem

Figure 9 Example of possible Built defences (a), natural defences (b), hybrid defences (c), and some of their strengths and weakness. Figure, and table content adapted from Sutton-Grier et al., 2015 (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.04.006).

Some detailed comments:

- line 52-53: not clear which point the authors want to make with this statement. There is no reference to literature for this statement. Is this statement supported?

We removed the statement.

- line 92: missing reference Liu et al. 2012

We added the reference:

Liu, Y., Weisberg, R.H., Vignudelli, S., Roblou, L. and Merz, C.R., 2012. Comparison of the X-TRACK altimetry estimated currents with moored ADCP and HF radar observations on the West Florida Shelf. *Advances in Space Research*, *50*(8), pp.1085-1098.

- line 104: missing references Foster et al. 2013 ; Moller et al. 2014

We added the missed references

Foster, N.M., Hudson, M.D., Bray, S. and Nicholls, R.J., 2013. Intertidal mudflat and saltmarsh conservation and sustainable use in the UK: A review. *Journal of environmental management*, *126*, pp.96-104.

Möller, I., Kudella, M., Rupprecht, F., Spencer, T., Paul, M., Van Wesenbeeck, B.K., Wolters, G., Jensen, K., Bouma, T.J., Miranda-Lange, M. and Schimmels, S., 2014. Wave attenuation over coastal salt marshes under storm surge conditions. *Nature Geoscience*, *7*(10), pp.727-731.

- line 326-334: this section needs careful rewriting; there is little or no interpretation of the physical mechanisms of wave dissipation. While in the article of Le Hir et al. 2000 emphasis is on dissipation due to the interaction with a muddy bottom, in the article of Moller et al. 2006 vegetation plays an explicit role. Wave dissipation is related to orbital motion which does not only depend on wave height but also on wave period. At the end the resulting wave height is a balance between what is put into the wave field (by wind) and what is lost by dissipation. These aspects are ignored here (and they seem to have been ignored to some extent in the paper of Le Hir et al. and even more so in the paper of Moller et al.

We completely rewrote the section in regard to energy dissipation by vegetation, and added more physically based consideration in this regard. The new section is the following:

"The majority of existing studies schematize vegetation with an array of cylinders having a given diameter, density, height, and stiffness level (e.g. Morison et al., 1950; Darlymple et al., 1984; Fonseca and Cahalan, 1992; Kobayashi et al., 1993). The energy of wind waves passing through a vegetated surface is dissipated by the work done by waves on the vegetation. The time averaged rate of energy dissipation per unit horizontal area caused by vegetation, ε_v can be expressed as (e.g. Darlymple et al., 1984; Beudin et al., 2017):

$$\varepsilon_v = \overline{\int_{-h}^{-h+ah} Fudz}$$

Equation 1

Where h is the water depth, ah is the vegetation height, the overbar represents the time averaging of the dissipation term, F is the horizontal component of the force acting on the vegetation, and u is the horizontal velocity due to wave motion. Furthermore, Luhar et al., 2010, demonstrated that even when the motion is driven by a purely oscillatory flow, a mean current in the direction of wave propagation is generated within the meadow. This current is forced by non-zero wave stress similar to the streaming observed in wave boundary layers, and the current is approximately four times the one predicted by the laminar boundary layer theory. According to Morison et al., 1950, the force, F, can be expressed as the sum of a drag force, and an inertia force; the drag force is proportional to a drag coefficient, and to the square of the horizontal flow velocity, and the inertia force is proportional to an inertia coefficient and to the acceleration of the flow. When the effect of plants flexibility is taken into account, drag and inertia force can be expressed as a function of the velocity difference between the fluid and the plant rather than of the sole flow velocity (e.g. Morison et al., 1950). In case of very stiff plants, the drag component is considered dominant, and the inertial forces can be neglected (Morison et al., 1950; Darlymple et al., 1984).

Standard approaches for the prediction of wave energy attenuation by vegetation, are based on the equation for the conservation of energy where the local flow field is estimated using linear wave theory. The general form of the energy conservation equation can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial E c_g}{\partial x} = \varepsilon_v$$

Equation. 2

Where, E, is the wave energy, and c_g is the group velocity. This approach, while reasonable, might be compromised if the vegetation substantially modifies the flow field. An alternative approach was proposed by Kobayashi et al., 1993, for the submerged vegetation case, for which the problem was formulated by using the continuity and linearized momentum equations for the regions over and within the vegetation canopy.

Field measurements confirm that the dissipation of wind waves increases with increasing relative wave height, i.e. the ratio between wave height and water depth (e.g. Le Hir et al., 2000, Moeller, 2006), and decreasing submergence ratio, i.e. ratio between water depth and plant height (Yang et al., 2012; Augustin et al., 2009; Paul et al., 2012).

Field measurements of wind waves over sand flat to salt marsh cross-shore transects, also showed that wave energy dissipation over salt marshes is significantly higher (up to 82% of the energy is dissipated) then on sand flats (29% dissipation) (Moeller, 1999). While part of the wave damping effect is attributable to the reduction in water depth on the higher elevated marsh platform (relative to the lower elevated tidal flat), the energy dissipation over salt marshes is up to 50 % stronger even under similar water depth conditions, which demonstrates the important role of vegetation in the dissipation process.

Wave damping is also strictly related to the relative motion between fluid and plants, which depends on plants stems flexibility, stems diameter, and stems length. Stems with relatively high stiffness tend to follow an oscillatory swaying movement throughout the wave cycle, while more flexible stems tend to bend in the dominant direction of the orbital flow with a high angle which results in canopy flattening, and loss of flow resistance (whip-like movement) (e.g. Luhar and Nepf, 2016; Mullarney and Henderson, 2010; Paul et al., 2016). The movement can switch from swaying to whip-like as the wave energy increases (for example during storm periods) (e.g. Luhar and Nepf, 2016). Increasing plant flexibility reduces the damping of waves as stems tend to move with the surrounding water (Bouma et al., 2005; Elwany et al., 1995; Riffe et al., 2011), however stiff plants can break if hydrodynamic loads are higher than a critical value (Heuner et al., 2015; Puijalon et al., 2011; Silinski et al., 2015). The dissipative contribution given by flexible plants is low, but their deformed configuration (flattening) under high orbital velocities (≥ 74 cm s^{-1}) helps to stabilize surface sediments (Neumeier and Ciavola, 2004; Peralta et al., 2008). In contrast, more rigid plants can reach breakage (from medium orbital velocities), increase turbulence and sediment scouring around the stems, and cause more erosion due to increased shear stress values (Spencer et al., 2016). Vegetation stems also tend to flatten as the storm progresses, this causes the dissipation of wave energy to decrease, but as suggested by previous work, this flattening might promote the stabilization of the substrate. Paul et al., (2016) tested different artificial vegetation elements to measure drag forces on vegetation under different wave loading. They found that stiffness and dynamic frontal areas (e.g. frontal area resulting from bending) are the main factors determining drag forces, while the still frontal area of plants dominate the force-velocity relationship only for low orbital velocities. In the same experiments as reported by Moeller et al. 2014, Rupprecht et al., 2017, tested the effectiveness of two typical NW European salt marsh grasses (Puccinellia maritima, and Elymus athericus) under simulated storms an no-storms conditions. For their specific field site, they found that under high water levels and long wave periods, within the flexible Puccinellia canopy the orbital velocity decreased, while for the more rigid stems of Elymus, no significant changes in orbital velocity were found. Conversely, under low water levels, and short wave periods, Elymus reduced near bed velocity more than Puccinellia. As expected, more flexible stems of Puccinellia were able to more easily survive the more severe conditions, while the more stiff Elymus plants were subject to structural damage."



Figure 4

Sketch of three different flow regimes, i.e. no vegetation, submerged vegetation, emergent vegetation; different flow profiles, and different sources of turbulence within the flow are present depending on vegetation height with respect to water depth. The dominant source of turbulence is respectively (from left to right) the bed, the top of the canopy (shear layer), and the stem wakes. Figure slightly adapted from Beudin et al., 2017. The figure refer to the development of a coupled wave-flow-vegetation interaction model in COAWST (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2016.12.010).

- line 335-341: it is clear that friction coefficients are different for a sandy bottom than for a vegetated salt marsh (which might even have a muddy bottom?). Note that in Figure 4 the y-axis is in J/m^2 which is the total energy and not a reduction. The reduction in % is given above the bars (except fo r

the sandy bottom). This figure is to some extent meaningless if the set-up of the experiment is not explained (what is the offshore wave condition, same distance between wave offshore point and wave measurement point on the sand flat and salt marsh,...)
We removed the figure, and rewrote the section; please see previous comments.

- line 365: the 60% is configuration specific (not a general statement)
We removed this sentence.

- line 380-386: reduction of orbital velocity of 35% is experiment specific, not a general statement. Such statements need a careful interpretation of the flume experiments in the GWK. On first view the measurement position of the EMC (electro magnetic current meter) seems inside the vegetated zone, and therefore very likely within the wave boundary layer.
We specified that field measurements are site-specific: “For their specific field site, they found that under high water levels and long wave periods, within the flexible Puccinellia canopy the orbital velocity decreased, while for the more rigid stems of Elymus, no significant changes in orbital velocity were found.”

- line 436: not fully clear if the 6 cm erosion rates is a total rate for the two hurricanes (Erin and Opal) or if there was twice an erosion rate of 6 cm, i.e. 6cm after the first hurricane (Erin) and 6 cm after the second (Opal).

We changed as follows “…erosion rates of 6 cm after the occurrence of two hurricanes, Hurricane Erin, and Opal, 1995…”

- line 472: what is a high occurence of extreme events => if an extreme event occurs frequently it should be definition no longer be an extreme event
We changed as follows: “A high occurrence of intense storms…”

- line 691: typo minerognic => minerogenic corrected

- line 784-785: the assumption of increase in magnitude but reduced frequency of extreme events seems a strange assumption to me. When looking at extreme events, a specific magnitude should be connected to a specific return period. Keeping the magnitude constant, the return period for this magnitude should either increase, decrease or not be affected by e.g. climate change.

We rephrased the sentence following the IPCC, 2007 : “According to the IPCC (Meehl et al., 2007), it is likely that there will be an increase in peak wind intensities, and near storm precipitations in future cyclones, with an increased occurrence of violent storms in spite of the likely decrease in the total number of storm. “

***Highlights (for review)**

- Salt marshes are effective in dissipating wave energy, and storm surges
- Salt marshes are generally able to withstand violent storms without collapsing
- Importance of indirect long term impact of storms rather than of sole after-storm periods

*Abstract
Click here to view linked References

Abstract

This manuscript reviews the progresses made in the understanding of the dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes, including the dissipation of extreme water levels and wind waves across marsh surfaces, the geomorphic impact of storms on salt marshes, the preservation of hurricanes signals and deposits into the sedimentary records, and the importance of storms for the long term survival of salt marshes to sea level rise. A review of weaknesses, and strengths of coastal defences incorporating the use of salt marshes including natural, and hybrid infrastructures in comparison to standard built solutions is then presented.

Salt marshes are effective in dissipating wave energy, and storm surges, especially when the marsh is highly elevated, and continuous. This buffering action reduces for storms lasting more than one day. Storm surge attenuation rates range from 1.7 to 25 cm/km depending on marsh and storms characteristics. In terms of vegetation properties, the more flexible stems tend to flatten during powerful storms, and to dissipate less energy but they are also more resilient to structural damage, and their flattening helps to protect the marsh surface from erosion, while stiff plants tend to break, and could increase the turbulence level and the scour. From a morphological point of view, salt marshes are generally able to withstand violent storms without collapsing, and violent storms are responsible for only a small portion of the long term marsh erosion.

Our considerations highlight the necessity to focus on the *indirect* long term impact that large storms exerts on the whole marsh complex rather than on sole after-storm periods. The morphological consequences of storms, even if not dramatic, might in fact influence the response of the system to normal weather conditions during following inter-storm periods. For instance, storms can cause tidal flats deepening which in turn promotes wave energy propagation, and exerts a long term detrimental effect for marsh boundaries even during calm weather. On the other hand, when a violent storm causes substantial erosion but sediments are redistributed across nearby areas, the long term impact might not be as severe as if sediments were permanently lost from the system, and the salt marsh could easily recover to the initial state.

Dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes: a review

Nicoletta Leonardi (a*), Iacopo Carnacina (b), Carmine Donatelli (a), Neil Kamal Ganju (c), Andrew James Plater (a), Mark Schuerch (d), Stijn Temmerman (e)

* Corresponding author nicleona@liverpool.ac.uk

(a) University of Liverpool, Department of Geography and Planning, 74 Bedford St S. Liverpool, UK

(b) Liverpool John Moores University, Department of Civil Engineering, Peter Jost Enterprise Centre, Byrom Street, Liverpool, L3 3AF

(c) U.S. Geological Survey, Woods Hole Coastal and Marine Science Center, MA 02543, USA

(d) Cambridge Coastal Research Unit (CCRU) Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge, CB2 3EN, United Kingdom

(e) Ecosystem Management Research Group, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

Abstract

~~The action of storms, and associated large waves and inundation depths, can strongly alter horizontal and vertical salt marsh dynamics in the immediate after-storm period, as well as in the longer term.~~ This manuscript reviews the progresses made in the understanding of the dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes, including the dissipation of extreme water levels and wind waves across marsh surfaces, the geomorphic impact of storms on salt marshes, the preservation of hurricanes signals and deposits into the sedimentary records, and the importance of storms for the long term survival of salt marshes to sea level rise. A review of weaknesses, and strengths of coastal defences incorporating the use of salt marshes including natural, and hybrid infrastructures in comparison to standard built solutions is then presented.

Salt marshes are effective in dissipating wave energy, and storm surges, especially when the marsh is highly elevated, and continuous~~, and more than 10km wide~~. This buffering action~~, is very effective during moderate storms, but~~reduces ~~less efficient~~ for ~~long~~ storms lasting more than one day~~; for this reason the use of hybrid approaches, combining continuous marshes with engineered defence structures is recommended for coastal protection~~. Storm surge attenuation rates range from 1.7 to 25 cm/km depending on marsh and storms characteristics. In terms of vegetation properties, the more flexible stems tend to flatten during powerful storms, and to dissipate less energy but they are also more resilient to structural damage, and their flattening helps to protect the marsh surface from erosion, while stiff plants tend to break, and could increase the turbulence level and the scour. From a morphological point of view, salt marshes are generally able to withstand violent storms without collapsing, and violent storms are responsible for only a small portion of the long term marsh erosion.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

~~From a morphological point of view, o~~Our considerations highlight the necessity to focus on the *indirect* long term impact that large storms exerts on the whole marsh complex rather than on sole after-storm periods. The morphological consequences of storms, even if not dramatic, might in fact influence the response of the system to normal weather conditions during following inter-storm periods. For instance, s~~S~~torms can cause tidal flats deepening which in turn promotes wave energy propagation, and exerts a long term detrimental effect for marsh boundaries even during calm weather. On the other hand, when a violent storm causes substantial erosion but sediments are redistributed across nearby areas, the long term impact might not be as severe as if sediments were permanently lost from the system, and the salt marsh could easily recover to the initial state.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Line spacing: single

1. Introduction

1.1 Changing storm activity

Many coastal areas are experiencing a change in both extreme and mean storm conditions as a consequence of a changing climate (e.g. Zhang et al., 2000; Webster et al., 2005; Bacmeister et al., 2016). For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (~~IPCC, ~~e.g. Solom et al., 2007; Pachauri et al., 2014) it is virtually certain (99-100% probability) that the intensity of cyclone activity has increased in the North Atlantic since 1970, even if there is low confidence that the long term changes are robust. In terms of extremes, it is likely (66-100% probability) that extreme sea levels such as the ones experienced during storm surges have increased since 1970 on a global average. The latter trend has been mainly attributed to an increase in mean sea level even if more studies are necessary to fully separate the effect of global mean sea level rise from the effects of more local modifications to the coastal systems (e.g. Pachauri et al., 2014). ~~Finally, it is also likely that there are more land regions where the number of heavy precipitation events has increased than where it has decreased.~~

Evaluations of future increases in storms and hurricanes activity are complex, and with large uncertainties. For example, a statistical correlation has been found between the power dissipation index of hurricanes (i.e. an index combining intensity, frequency and duration of hurricanes) and Atlantic Sea Surface Temperature (SST) (e.g. Vecchi et al., 2008). Based on this relationship and taking into account hurricanes activity since 1950, as well as future SST projection, there should be a 300% increase in hurricanes activity by the late 21st century. However, a statistical correlation has been also found between the power dissipation index and the Atlantic sea surface temperature relative to the Tropical mean sea temperature; if the latter relationship is considered, the projected change in hurricane activity by 2100 would be around 25%, which is modest with respect to the estimation above (Vecchi et al., 2008). Projections about the future of hurricanes activity might get even more complicated when looking at the longer term. Mean air temperature, Atlantic SST and the unadjusted hurricanes count all show a marked increase since the late 1800; however, when the raw hurricane count is adjusted for the storms which were not counted during the pre-satellite era due to technology, and ship track density limitations, no significant increase is observed (e.g. Vecchi et al., 2008). Generally, according to the IPCC (Meehl et al., 2007), it is likely that there will be an increase in peak wind intensities, and near storm precipitations in future cyclones, with an increased occurrence of violent storms in spite of the likely decrease in the total number of storm.

Figure 1 illustrates model results in relation to the 21st century changes in Emmanuel's (1995) wind maximum potential intensity (MPI_V), the increase of which is generally associated with an increase in storms activity and intensity (Vecchi and Sobel, 2007). Results refer to the IPCC-AR4 Scenario A1B for the period from June-November. The MPIv index increases over most of the northern hemisphere and tropical zone of the southern hemisphere, but there are also large areas particularly in the southern hemisphere indicating decreases. The regions where the MPI_V decreases are associated with a relative minimum in SST (e.g. Sobel et al., 2002).

On a regional scale~~, for instance~~, by using a barotropic type surge model and global conditions representative of the IPCC A2 SRES scenarios between 1961-1990 and 2071-2100, it was shown that storm surge extremes may ~~also~~ significantly increase along most of the North Sea coast toward the end of this century (Woth et al., 2006). ~~Recent results from~~ ~~e~~Ensemble simulation runs using Regional Climate Models for various locations in the United States (Jiang et al., 2016) also support the hypothesis of variations in future storm pattern; specifically, they predict shorter storm durations, longer inter-storms periods, and higher storms intensities.

In spite of the abundance of studies in relation to climatic projections and past trends, many challenges are still present, especially for the monitoring of coastal zones, due to limitations of some current modelling and field practice frameworks. For instance, the retrieval of waves and winds in the coastal areas is not yet as mature as sea level measurements, and the development of a wider applicability of altimetry techniques could be relevant for the simultaneous monitoring of wave height, wind speed and sea levels. In this context, Liu et al. ~~(2012~~2012~~)~~ showed the potential usefulness of the 1-Hz along-track altimetry data for the description of shelf areas, and Passaro et al., 2015 showed that estimations of wave height form ALES (Adaptive Leading Edge Sub-waveform retracker) were better correlated to buoy data than processed products. Such techniques could be coupled to standard modelling, and field data approach to build a more comprehensive and homogeneous database for the study of these coastal ecosystems

1.2. Pressures on salt marsh ecosystems

Salt marshes are important coastal ecosystems frequently fringing the interior of estuaries and bays, and establishing in low-energy inter-tidal zones. Due to their location and vegetated surfaces, salt marshes offer several ecosystem services. For example, their value for buffering against the impact of storms has been estimated up to 5 million USD per km^2 in the United States (e.g., Costanza et al., 2008), and 786 million GBP per year for UK marshes (UK National Ecosystem assessment, 2011; Foster et al., 2013; Moller et al., 2014). Indeed, there has been a rapidly increasing body of scientific literature on storm surge attenuation by salt marshes, and growing societal interest in so-called ecosystem-based or nature-based flood defence programs, i.e. marsh and mangrove restoration projects aiming to mitigate storm surge flood risks (e.g. Cheong et al., 2013; Sutton-Grier et al., 2015; Fagherazzi, 2014; Temmerman et al., 2013).

~~Indeed, in recent years, salt marsh conservation and restoration projects are increasingly adopted as part of coastal and estuarine flood defence programs, based on the concept of “living shorelines” or “nature-based solutions” for flood defence (e.g., Temmerman et al., 2013; Fagherazzi, 2014).~~

Apart from flood protection, other salt marsh services include the storage of sediments, pollutants, nutrients, as well as of large amounts of carbon at a geological time scale (e.g. Mudd, et al., 2009; Kirwan and Mudd, 2012; Pendleton et al., 2012). They are also the natural habitat of many plants and animal communities, and offer a place for recreational and touristic activities (e.g. Barbier et al., 2011).

The long-term persistence of salt marshes appears related to the maintenance of a delicate balance between sediment and nutrient inputs, and external agents such as wave energy, storm surges, tidal inundation, and sea level rise (e.g. Spencer et al., 1998; Plater et al., 1999; van de Koppel et al., 2005; Deegan et al., 2012; Fagherazzi et al., 2012; Kirwan et al., 2016; Leonardi et al., 2016). Figure 2 represents a sketch of some of the main physical

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Space After: 8 pt

and ecological processes acting on a salt marsh. This includes, for instance, the exchange of sediments between the tidal flat and the marsh platform, biomass production and sediment deposition on the marsh platform promoting vertical accretion, and possible erosion/ progradation of the marsh edge. Ultimately, the survival of salt marshes has been related to a sediment budget problem (Ganju et al., 2017).

Salt marshes have been found to be extremely vulnerable, and large salt marsh losses have been documented worldwide. For instance, for areas in the south west of the Netherlands and the Wadden Sea, marsh edge erosion rates up to 4 m/yr have been observed, in spite of vertical accretion rates in balance with sea level rise (e.g., Bakker et al., 1993). In England and Wales salt marsh areal loss has been estimated to be around 83 ha yr^{-1} (Environment Agency, 2011; Foster et al., 2013), 105 ha yr^{-1} for the period in between 1993 and 2013 (Pye and French, 1993), and is projected to be 349 ha yr^{-1} for the period between 1998 and 2048 (Lee, 2001). In the Greater Thames area, the erosion was estimated to be around 25% of the total area present in 1973 (Cooper et al., 2009), while in the Solent (UK) 40% of the total salt marsh area present in 1971 was eroded between 1971 and 2001 (Cope et al., 2008). Erosion up to 80 cm/yr has been recently measured in the northern part of the Venice Lagoon (e.g., Bendoni et al., 2016). For the East Coast of the United States, in Plum Sound and the Virginia Coast Reserve, salt marsh boundary erosion rates ranged from a couple of cm up to 3 m/yr over a 7-year measuring period (Leonardi and Fagherazzi, 2014, 2015). In Barnegat Bay, New Jersey, USA, erosion rates from 1930 to 2007, and from 2007 to 2013, were similar, with around half of the marsh area that fringes the interior of the bay eroding less than 0.5 m/yr, the other half displaying erosion rates up to 2 m/yr, and only a 3 percent eroding faster than 2 m/yr (Leonardi et al., 2016b). A recent global analysis on salt marsh erosion and wave measurements by Leonardi et al., 2016a revealed that most of salt marsh deterioration is caused by moderate storms of a monthly frequency while intense hurricanes contribute to less than 1% to long term salt marsh erosion rates.

The action of storms and associated wind waves and storm surges can strongly alter both horizontal and vertical salt marsh dynamics in the immediate after-storm period, as well as in the long term, by affecting erosion/ deposition, and sediment import/ export in salt marshes and surrounding areas. Furthermore, storms generate serious flood risks in low-lying and highly populated coastal zones. For these reasons, and especially under a climate change perspective, it is important to understand the reciprocal interaction between storms and salt marshes. This manuscript aims to review progresses made in the understanding of salt marsh-storms interactions, and is organized as follows: we first review storm surges (section 2), and wind waves (section 3) attenuation across salt marshes. In section 4 we focus on the impact of storms on salt marshes morphology, and on the preservation of hurricanes signals into the sedimentary records. Section 5 focuses on the impact of storms on the marsh sediment budget. Section 7 discusses how the interplay between storms occurrence and sea level rise influences salt marsh survival. A set of discussions and conclusions is finally presented.

2. Storm surge attenuation by salt marsh

~~Vegetated coastal ecosystems, in particular salt marshes and mangroves, are increasingly valued for their protective function against storm surge flood risks. This is illustrated by the rapidly increasing number of scientific studies on storm surge attenuation by salt marshes and mangroves, and growing societal interest in so-called ecosystem-based or nature-based flood defence programs, i.e. marsh and mangrove restoration projects aiming to mitigate storm surge flood risks (e.g. Cheong et al., 2013; Sutton-Grier et al., 2015; Temmerman et al., 2013).~~ The effectiveness of storm surge height reduction behind marshes is commonly quantified as the attenuation rate in cm of surge height reduction per km distance that the storm surge has propagated over marshes (e.g. Wamsley et al., 2010).

However, mechanistic insights in the various factors that control this attenuation rate are rather fragmentary presented in recent literature, which may be one reason why real life implementations of nature-based flood defences ~~are relatively scarce so far~~are not as diffuse as engineered solutions (Temmerman et al., 2013). Here in this section, we review the most recent scientific insights.

Although anecdotal evidence of storm surge protection behind large marshes is presented in early reports (e.g. Lovelace, 1994; USACE, 1963), systematic evidence and mechanistic studies only started to accumulate over the past 10 years. In particular major coastal flood disasters caused by the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 and hurricane Katrina along the US Gulf coast in 2005 boosted worldwide scientific and public awareness of the potentially important protective role of mangroves (Danielsen et al., 2005) and salt marshes (Day et al., 2007).

A first important source of empirical evidence comes from studies that analysed the reduction of damage or human deaths as a function of marsh or mangrove width between coastal settlements and the open sea. For example, Costanza et al., 2008, performed an extensive analysis of 34 major hurricanes that hit the US Atlantic and Gulf coasts since 1980, demonstrating that damage to properties was significantly reduced behind marshes, and that a loss of 1 ha of marshes would increase average storm damages by 33000 USD. For mangroves, Das and Vincent, 2009, showed that villages that were hit by a tropical cyclone surge in India experienced significantly lower numbers of deaths when they had wider mangroves between them and the coast.

A second source of empirical evidence, are direct measurements of storm surge height reduction within and behind large marshes. Data reported in the literature are especially from the US Gulf coast (e.g. Lovelace, 1994; McGee et al., 2006; USACE, 1963), which is regularly hit by hurricane storm surges and where wide marshlands of several tens of kilometres exist in the Mississippi delta and in back-barrier tidal lagoons. A rule of thumb, derived from these reports, is that peak surge levels are reduced by on average 1 m for every 14.5 km that the surge has propagated over marshes (i.e. ~6.9 cm/km), with large variations between individual hurricane events as much as from 1 m surge reduction per 4 km of marshland (i.e. 25 cm/km) to only 1 m per 60 km (i.e. ~1.7 cm/km) (based on data compilation by Wamsley et al., 2010). This large variation in empirical data indicates that storm surge propagation and attenuation over marshes is complex and that the effectiveness of surge height reduction largely varies depending on specific storm characteristics, marsh ecosystem properties and larger-scale coastal landscape settings. For a macro-tidal estuarine marsh in the SW Netherlands, Stark et al., 2015, presented a large dataset ranging from regular tides to storm surges, showing that the magnitude of tidal and storm tide attenuation strongly depends on the marsh inundation depth and the dimensions of channels that dissect the marsh landscape. Maximum attenuation rates of up to 5 cm/km were measured over marsh transects with smaller channels and for marsh inundation depths of 0.5-1 m, while attenuation rates decreased for shallower and deeper inundation events, including storm surges. For mangroves in Southern Florida, hurricane surge attenuation rates of 9.4 cm/km have been measured over relatively continuous mangrove forests, and slightly lower rates for mangroves along a river corridor (Krauss et al., 2009).

Hydrodynamic modelling studies are a third line of evidence and important research tools to disentangle the various factors controlling the effectiveness of storm surge height reduction by wetlands. Comparing the rapidly growing number of publications in the past few years~~ (see below)~~, we can generally make a distinction between two main mechanisms that depend on the larger-scale landscape setting: (1) storm surge attenuation within and behind continuous marshes is basically due to *friction* exerted by the marsh vegetation and soil on the landward propagating storm surge (e.g. Sheng et al., 2012); and (2) storm surges propagating through an estuarine or deltaic channel or embayment can be attenuated due to lateral flooding and *water storage* on marshes adjacent to that channel (e.g. Smolders et al., 2015). The frictional effect (1) is called here *within-marsh attenuation* and the water storage effect (2) *along-channel attenuation*. Ultimately both take place in most real cases, as marshes and mangroves are typically dissected by networks of tidal channels, implying that surge propagation along these channels is affected by both frictional and lateral water storage effects (e.g. Stark et al., 2016).

Modelling studies, either for idealized marsh geometries (e.g. Loder et al., 2009; Sheng et al., 2012; Temmerman et al., 2012) or for specific more realistic landscape settings (e.g Resio and Westerink, 2008; Wamsley et al., 2010; Wamsley et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2012), demonstrate that the effectiveness of storm surge attenuation depends on specific properties of (1) the storm forcing (such as storm intensity, duration, forward moving speed, storm track), (2) the marsh ecosystem (such as marsh size and soil elevation, vegetation density and continuity, within-marsh channel dimensions), and (3) larger-scale coastal landscape settings (such as off-shore bathymetry, shoreline shape, open coast, back-barrier, estuarine or deltaic setting, levees or dikes behind marshes, etc.).

In terms of effects of storm characteristics, attenuation rates are generally higher for shallow to moderate storm surge levels and decrease for more extreme storm surges that deeply submerge the marshes, as within-marsh frictional effects on the storm surge attenuation relatively decrease with increasing water depth on the marsh (Lawler et al., 2016; Resio and Westerink, 2008; Sheng et al., 2012; Wamsley et al., 2010). Similarly, marshes with a higher soil elevation are more effective in attenuating higher storm surges (Loder et al., 2009; Smolders et al., 2015; Stark et al., 2016), implying that marshes with a sediment accretion deficit and consequently decreasing surface elevation relative to rising sea level, lose their effectiveness for storm surge protection (Temmerman et al., 2012; Wamsley et al., 2009). The protective function also decreases for storms with a longer duration, as the surge has more time to propagate landward and to fill up the whole marsh area (Resio and Westerink, 2008; Wamsley et al., 2010). Similarly, storm surge attenuation behind wetlands is more effective for storms with a faster forward moving speed (Hu et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2013; Sheng et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2012).

In terms of marsh ecosystem properties, ~~obviously~~ wider marshes, of at least 10 or more kilometres wide, as well as marshes with a higher soil elevation, are more effective in dissipating the surge~~, as well as marshes with a higher soil elevation, as explained above~~. Effectiveness of storm surge attenuation also markedly increases ~~when marsh vegetation is simulated that exerts more friction (Hu et al., 2015; Loder et al., 2009; Sheng et al., 2012), and~~ with higher ratios of marsh vegetation to open water (Loder et al., 2009; Temmerman et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2012; Hu et al., 2015; ~~Loder et al., 2009;~~ Sheng et al., 2012)), implying that patchy patterns of gradual marsh degradation, which are observed in several marshes around the world (e.g. Schepers et al., 2017), lead to loss ~~of their~~the storm protection function of marshes (Temmerman et al., 2012). The dimension~~s~~ of the tidal channels ~~channels, which typically cut into marshes,~~ also influences surge attenuation~~play a major role~~; ~~:~~ for instance, numerical simulations show that ~~simulations with deeper or wider channels, show that~~ the landward flood propagation through the channels is facilitated with deeper or wider channels, leading to less storm surge height reduction (Stark et al., 2016; Temmerman et al., 2012). ~~(~~Stark et al., 2016~~)~~ showed for a marsh in the SW Netherlands that the effects of within-marsh channel dimensions, marsh platform elevation and storm surge height can be combined into one parameter predicting variations in attenuation rate from 0 to nearly 25 cm/km, i.e. as a function of the ratio between the water volume that is present at high tide above the marsh platform and the total water volume above the platform and in the channels (Figure 3).

Finally, the precise rates of storm surge attenuation by marshes depend on case-specific larger-scale landscape settings. For example, significant storm surge attenuation by wetlands is simulated for the several tens of kilometres wide marshes in the Mississippi deltaic area (Barbier et al., 2013; Hu et al., 2015; Resio and Westerink, 2008; Wamsley et al., 2010; Wamsley et al., 2009) and wide mangrove systems in Southern Florida (Liu et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2012), while more moderate to limited contribution of marshes to storm surge protection are simulated for marshes along the Chesapeake Bay (Haddad et al., 2016), and back-barrier lagoon systems of Jamaica Bay, New York (Marsooli et al., 2016) and the Delmarva coast (Lawler et al., 2016). For the case of marshes occurring along the funnel shaped Scheldt estuary in the Netherlands and Belgium, simulations show that marshes of the same size but located more upstream are more effective in attenuating storm surges propagating ~~upstream~~ inland along the estuarine channel (Smolders et al., 2015). Man-made structures, in particular coastal defence structures such as levees and dikes behind marshes, may cause the setup of water levels against these structures and hence limit the storm surge attenuating effect of marshes in front of such structures, as shown for example in simulations for the 2005 hurricanes Katrina and Rita in the Mississippi delta (Wamsley et al., 2009). Similarly, for a marsh in the SW Netherlands, (Stark et al., 2016) showed blockage effects and setup of peak surge levels against dikes behind the marsh, and that the marsh width needs to be at least 6-10 km to avoid such blockage effects and to maximize the rate of storm surge attenuation.

Summarizing, we may say that empirical data and modelling studies demonstrate effective storm surge height reduction behind large (at least 10 km wide), high-elevated and continuous marshes with few or small channels, and by marshes located more inland along funnel-shaped estuarine and deltaic channels, especially during moderate storm surges, but less effectively during extreme storms that ~~continue~~ last for more than a day. The latter implies that solely relying on nature-based flood defences in populated low-lying coastal and estuarine areas ~~is commonly~~ might sometimes be not~~not~~ ~~advised~~advisable. Instead so-called hybrid approaches, combining conservation and restoration of continuous marshes with engineered defence structures, are increasingly developed and implemented worldwide (Sutton-Grier et al., 2015; Temmerman and Kirwan, 2015; Van Wesenbeeck et al., 2014), e.g. on large scales in the Mississippi delta (CPRA, 2012) and Scheldt estuary in Belgium (Meire et al., 2014). An important argument for such hybrid approaches, is that they are more cost-effective as they do not only provide flood risk mitigation but also other valuable ecosystem services, and marshes and mangroves build up land with rising sea levels, making them self-adaptive defences in face of global change (e.g., Temmerman et al., 2013).

3. Wave energy dissipation by salt marsh

Salt marshes are natural wave energy dampers (e.g. Moeller, 2006; Moeller et al., 2014;

Spencer et al., 2016; Beudin et al., 2017). For shallow water, the dissipation of wave energy is related to the viscous boundary layer friction, permeability, and viscous layer of the seabed (e.g. Le Hir et al., 2000). Over a salt marsh the bed-roughness might be considered as the result of two contributions, i.e., vegetation induced friction, and topographic variations over the marsh surface (Hartnall, 1984; Dijkema, 1987; Pethick, 1992). It is also recognized that wave attenuation is affected by plant characteristics such as geometry, stem density, spatial coverage, and stiffness, and that hydrodynamic conditions such as water depth (figure 4), wave period, and wave height are relevant.

~~The pioneer work conducted in relation to the interaction between wave oscillatory motion and vegetation has been mainly aimed at quantifying wave attenuation within~~

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

~~vegetation~~The majority of existing studies schematize vegetation with an array of cylinders having a given diameter, density, height, and stiffness level –(e.g. Morison et al., 1950; Darlymple et al., 1984; Fonseca and Cahalan, 1992; Kobayashi et al., 1993).- -The energy of wind waves passing through a vegetated surface is dissipated by the work done by waves on the vegetation. The time averaged rate of energy dissipation per unit horizontal area caused by vegetation, ε_v can be expressed as (e.g. Darlymple et al., 1984; Beudin et al., 2017):

$$\varepsilon_v = \overline{\int_{-h}^{-h+ah} Fudz}$$

Equation 1

Where h is the water depth, ah is the vegetation height, the overbar represents the time averaging of the dissipation term, F is the horizontal component of the force acting on the vegetation, and u is the horizontal velocity due to wave motion. Furthermore, Luhar et al., 2010, demonstrated that even when the motion is driven by a purely oscillatory flow, a mean current in the direction of wave propagation is generated within the meadow. This current is forced by non-zero wave stress similar to the streaming observed in wave boundary layers, and the current is approximately four times the one predicted by the laminar boundary layer theory. According to Morison et al., 1950, the force, F, can be expressed as the sum of a drag force, and an inertia force; the drag force is proportional to a drag coefficient, and to the square of the horizontal flow velocity, and the inertia force is proportional to an inertia coefficient and to the acceleration of the flow. When the effect of plants flexibility is taken into account, drag and inertia force can be expressed as a function of the velocity difference between the fluid and the plant rather than of the sole flow velocity (e.g. Morison et al., 1950). In case of very stiff plants, the drag component is considered dominant, and the inertial forces can be neglected (Morison et al., 1950; Darlymple et al., 1984).

~~The pioneer work conducted in relation to the interaction between wave oscillatory motion and vegetation has been mainly aimed at quantifying wave attenuation within vegetation (e.g. Fonseca and Cahalan, 1992; Kobayashi et al., 1993).~~ Standard approaches for the prediction of wave energy attenuation by vegetation, are based on the equation for the conservation of energy where the local flow field is estimated using linear wave theory. The general form of the energy conservation equation can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial E c_g}{\partial x} = \varepsilon_v$$

Equation. 2

Where, E, is the wave energy, and c_g is the group velocity. This approach, while reasonable, might be compromised if the vegetation substantially modifies the flow field. An alternative approach was proposed by Kobayashi et al., 1993, for the submerged vegetation case, for which the problem was formulated by using the continuity and linearized momentum equations for the regions over and within the vegetation canopy. ~~By considering the effect of vegetation in terms of drag coefficient, introducing an unknown damping coefficient, and linearizing the friction term, they obtained an analytical solution for small monochromatic waves whose amplitude has been found to decay exponentially in the propagation direction. Koch and Gust, 1999, suggested that the periodic motion of seagrass blades also promotes mass transfer between the meadow, and the overlying water column. Luhar et al., 2010, demonstrated that even when the motion is driven by a purely oscillatory flow, a mean current in the direction of wave propagation is generated within the meadow. This current is forced by non-zero wave stress similar to the streaming observed in wave boundary layers, and the current is approximately four times the one predicted by the laminar boundary layer theory.~~

Formatted: Right

Field measurements confirm ~~Among others, t~~that the dissipation of wind waves ~~has been found to~~ increases with increasing relative wave height, i.e. the ra~~t~~tio between wave height and water depth (e.g. Le Hir et al., 2000, Moeller, 2006), and decreasing submergence ratio, i.e. ratio between water depth and plant height (Yang et al., 2012; Augustin et al., 2009; Paul et al., 2012). ~~.~~

~~Another parameter controlling the rate of energy dissipation is the ratio between water depth and plants height (submergence ratio, i.e. Yang et al., 2012): the smaller this ratio, the larger the wave attenuation rate (Augustin et al., 2009; Paul et al., 2012). Field measurements in England support this relationship, and show that for the analyzed field sites the relationship was mainly valid for relative wave height ratios above a critical lower limit and below 0.55; when the ratio is below the lower limit, waves become too small (or water depth to high) to have an effective vegetation-wave interaction; however, when the relative wave height is > 0.55, the relationship between wave dissipation and relative wave height becomes invalid because the maximum dissipation capacity of vegetation has been reached (Moeller, 2006).~~

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

Field measurements of wind waves over sand flat to salt marsh cross-shore transects, also showed ~~also suggest~~ that wave energy dissipation over salt marshes is significantly higher (up to 82% of the energy is dissipated) then on sand flats (29% dissipation) (Moeller, 1999~~, Figure 4~~). While part of the wave damping effect is attributable to the reduction in water depth on the higher elevated marsh platform (relative to the lower elevated tidal flat), the energy dissipation over salt marshes is up to 50 % stronger even under similar water depth conditions, which ~~proves~~ demonstrates the important role of vegetation in the dissipation process.

~~Another parameter controlling the rate of energy dissipation is the ratio between water depth and plants height (submergence ratio, i.e. Yang et al., 2012): the smaller this ratio, the larger the wave attenuation rate (Augustin et al., 2009; Paul et al., 2012).~~ Wave damping is also strictly related to the relative motion between fluid and plants, which depends on plants stems flexibility, stems diameter, and stems length. Stems with relatively high stiffness tend to follow an oscillatory swaying movement throughout the wave cycle, while more flexible stems tend to bend in the dominant direction of the orbital flow with a high angle which results in canopy flattening, and loss of flow resistance (whip-like movement) (~~i.e.~~e.g. Luhar and Nepf, 2016; Mullarney and Henderson, 2010; Paul et al., 2016). The movement can switch from swaying to whip-like as the wave energy increases (for example during storm periods) (e.g. Luhar and Nepf, 2016). Increasing plant flexibility reduces the damping of waves as stems tend to move with the surrounding water (Bouma et al., 2005; Elwany et al., 1995; Riffe et al., 2011), however stiff plants can break if hydrodynamic loads are higher than a critical value (Heuner et al., 2015; Puijalon et al., 2011; Silinski et al., 2015). The dissipative contribution given by flexible plants is low, but their deformed configuration (flattening) under high orbital velocities ($\geq$ 74 cm s^{-1}) helps to stabilize surface sediments (Neumeier and Ciavola, 2004; Peralta et al., 2008). In contrast, more rigid plants can reach breakage (from medium orbital velocities), increase turbulence and sediment scouring around the stems, ~~(reference)~~ and cause more erosion due to increased shear stress values (Spencer et al., 2016).

~~During extreme storms and associated storm surges, waves and water levels are the highest, and hence it can be questioned whether, under these conditions, salt marshes still play a considerable role in wave attenuation. Large scale laboratory experiments (Moeller et al., 2014) confirm that, even under extreme conditions, wave energy dissipation by salt marshes is very high, and up to 60% of this wave energy reduction is attributed to the presence of vegetation. As the storm progresses, v~~Vegetation stems also tend to flatten as the storm progresses, ~~are gradually flattened and the~~ this causes ~~wave~~ the dissipation of wave energy to decrease~~s~~, but as suggested by previous work ~~(e.g. Neumeier and Ciavola, 2004;~~

~~Peralta et al., 2008)~~, this~~e~~ flattening ~~of vegetation promotes the stability~~might promote the stabilization of the substrate. Paul et al., (2016) tested different artificial vegetation elements to measure drag forces on vegetation under different wave loading. They found that stiffness and dynamic frontal areas (e.g. frontal area resulting from bending) are the main factors determining drag forces, while the still frontal area of plants dominate the force-velocity relationship only for low orbital velocities. ~~Rupprecht et al., 2015 presented biophysical properties of species commonly found in NW European salt marshes, and compared the performance of two methods for the non-destructive assessment of aboveground biomass during storms, i.e. measurements of light availability within vegetation canopy, and side-on photography vegetation, with the latter being found more accurate.~~ In the same experiments as reported by Moeller et al. 2014, Rupprecht et al., 2017, tested the effectiveness of two typical NW European salt marsh grasses (Puccinellia maritima, and Elymus athericus) under simulated storms an no-storms conditions. For their specific field site, ~~T~~they found that under high water levels and long wave periods, within the flexible Puccinellia canopy the orbital velocity ~~was reduced~~decreased~~ by 35%~~, while for the more rigid stems of Elymus, no significant changes in orbital velocity were found. ~~Differently~~Conversely, under low water levels, and short wave periods, Elymus reduced near bed velocity more than Puccinellia. As expected, more flexible stems of Puccinellia were able to more easily survive the more severe conditions, while the more stiff Elymus plants were subject to structural damage.

4. Storms impact on salt marsh morphology

In comparison to other wetlands, and from a morphological point of view, salt marshes have been found to be more resistant to the impact of storms; this has been mainly attributed to the increased shear strength conferred to the soil by the presence of root systems which are deeper than in other coastal areas such as freshwater wetlands, and floating marshes (e.g. Morton and Barras, 2011). Fagherazzi, 2014, interpreted the bimodal response of vegetated and unvegetated (e.g. sandy beaches) shorelines in terms of low/ high pass filter, suggesting that from a morphological standpoint vegetated shorelines are very effective in buffering (filtering out) very violent storms without damage, but less effective with moderate storms; vice-versa, unvegetated surfaces efficiently absorb energy from mild weather conditions, but generally collapse under high energy.

~~Nevertheless, the~~The impact of storms on salt marshes can significantly vary depending on both storms and ecosystem properties, and can translate into various geomorphic signatures. Some of these signatures have contrasting effects in relation to the long term resilience of the ecosystem. Apart from erosion and deposition processes, ~~affecting marsh platform, marsh shoreline, as well as surrounding tidal flats,~~ storms can also deform the marsh surface trough subsurface processes, and incision (e.g. Morton and Barras, 2011). This section presents a summary of some of the main geomorphic impacts of storms on salt marsh ecosystems (Figure 5).

4.1 Incision

For salt marshes, ponds generated during storms are generally much smaller and less frequent with respect to brackish and freshwater marsh ponds; they also maintain a more amorphous shape (with no preferential direction) in comparison to the more elongated ponds frequently found in freshwater marshes (e.g. Barras, 2011). These ponds are more easily formed where the terrain is already lower, and strong wind driven currents can erode surface sediments (e.g. Morton et al., 2011). Ponds can then enlarge in time due to subsequent storms, and can also deepen leading to a loss of sediments from the marsh (e.g. Mariotti, 2016). In fact, once the ponds are formed, these can expand even if the rest of the marsh platform is able to keep pace with sea level, and wave action; enlarged ponds can eventually connect to tidal channels (e.g. Mariotti and Fagherazzi, 2013; Schepers et al., 2017).

When a pond is connected to channels, it can recover if its bed is higher than the limit for vegetation growth, or if the deposition rate is larger than the rate of sea level rise. When these conditions are not satisfied, the pond enlarges, becomes susceptible to edge erosion due to internally generated wind waves, and the eroded sediments can get lost through tidal channels (Mariotti and Fagherazzi, 2013). Therefore, depending on the action of biological processes, and sedimentation rates, the formation and enlargement of ponds can be irreversible, or reversible with ponds eventually recovering back to the surrounding marsh platform elevation (e.g. Mariotti and Carr, 2014; Mariotti, 2016).

Plucked marsh features (e.g. Barras et al., 2007) are erosional signatures consisting of irregular scours ranging from around 2 to 20 m which can be found in saline as well as intermediate or freshwater marshes when the mineral matter represents a high percentage of the substrate. Plucked marsh features can occur independently from the elevation with respect to mean sea level, as long as the shear stress is sufficient to incise the areas (e.g. Barras et al., 2007).

4.2 Erosion – surface erosion, and ~~lateral~~ shore erosion

The denudation of the marsh from the vegetation cover (also referred to as root scalping, e.g. Priestas et al., 2015) can affect areas of the order of kilometres, and occurs when currents and waves induced shear stress strips vegetated surfaces. The depth of denudation determines the chances and the rate of recovery of the affected areas. If the eroded areas remain above the permanent submerged location, and the root system is not completely destroyed, the denudated zones can recover during the following growing seasons, otherwise the denuded areas might convert to pond or bare tidal flats (e.g.

Hendrickson, 1997). When root scalping occurs near the marsh edges, this can translate into, or enhance the lateral erosion of the marsh banks (e.g. Priestas et al., 2015).

As a consequence of waves generated shear stress, the tidal flats in front of the marsh can deepen which indirectly impacts salt marsh survival, because of an increased depth in front of the marsh can increase wave energy and promote lateral erosion (e.g. Fagherazzi et al., 2006). The erosion depth of the marsh platform can range from a few to several centimetres. For instance, Hendrickson, (1997), reported erosion rates of 6 cm after the occurrence of two hurricanes, ~~-~~Hurricane Erin, and Opal, (1995) for salt marshes in St. Marks River, Florida. However, the erosion of the marsh surface doesn't necessarily correspond to an elevation change as the deformation of the marsh platform trough subsurface processes, like compaction or soil swelling, can play an important role as well.

~~As a consequence of waves generated shear stress, the tidal flats in front of the marsh can deepen which indirectly impacts salt marsh survival, because of an increased depth in front of the marsh can increase wave energy and promote lateral erosion (e.g. Fagherazzi et al., 2006).~~

The lateral erosion of marsh shorelines has been found to be mainly dictated by the action of wind waves (e.g. Schwimmer, 2001; Marani et al., 2011; Leonardi et al., 2016a, b). For freshwater marshes, the lateral erosion taking place during hurricanes can be up to 100s m~~;~~. F~~f~~or salt marshes, ~~while~~ even if wave-induced lateral erosion is in the long term one of the main causes of deterioration, the lateral retreat occurring during hurricanes is relatively low due to the short, and impulsive nature of ~~these events~~hurricanes, and violent storms (e.g. Leonardi et al 2016a, b; Figure 6a). Based on a global dataset of salt marsh lateral erosion~~,~~ and wave data, it was found that the yearly retreat rate of marsh shorelines linearly increases with wave energy and a critical threshold in wave energy above which salt marsh erosion drastically accelerates is absent. Such critical threshold is instead more commonly found in sandy environments where erosion drastically increases once the sand dunes are over-washed. While the impact of hurricanes on salt marshes can be very strong, their low frequency and short duration lead to a relatively small effect, contributing ~~and they contribute to~~ only 1% of the erosion in the long term. On the contrary, moderate and frequently occurring storms with a monthly reoccurrence are the most dangerous for salt marsh survival (Leonardi et al., 2016a). ~~It is then reasonable to assume that a storm impacting a stretch of shoreline at 90 degrees has a potential to erode salt marshes which is higher than a storm whose waves are parallel to the shore (e.g. Tonelli et al., 2010).~~

Finally, in regard to lateral shorelines dynamics, the intensity of wind waves has been found to also modify the shape of marsh boundaries. ~~;~~ Leonardi and Fagherazzi, (2014, 2015) showed that the interplay between waves intensity and the spatial variability in marsh resistance determines the shape of marsh shorelines, as well as erosion rates predictability. The variability in erosional resistance is due to the presence of natural heterogeneities caused by different soil resistance and by ~~the variety of~~ ecological, and biological processes ~~interesting different marsh portions~~. In case of low wave energy conditions, the presence of a variability in erosional resistance might lead to the unpredictable failure of large marsh portions with respect to average erosion rates, and to rough, and jagged marsh boundary profiles displaying high sinuosity values (e.g. Figure 6b, top panel). High-wave-energy conditions, while overall leading to a faster marsh deterioration, cause a constant and predictable erosion, and a smooth marsh boundary profile. A high occurrence of intense storms~~extreme events~~ significantly smooths the marsh boundary, even if it doesn't strongly alter average erosion rates (Figure 6b). Finally, salt marshes subject to weak wave energy conditions are the most susceptible to variations in the frequency of extreme events (Leonardi et al., 2014, 2015).

Marsh incision, and marsh erosion are strictly related, and the external agents leading to erosion and incision are frequently the same. While being interconnected, the idea of incision is here kept separated from the one of erosion, as it refers to newly formed features, which are small at the scale of the entire marsh complex, while the erosional mechanisms described above and in figure 5 refer to the deterioration of existing, and relatively well-defined marsh components.

4.3 Deposition

The occurrence of storms and hurricanes can be accompanied by the deposition of large amount of sediments. As an example, Hurricane Rita generated 4-5 m of storm surge, which resulted in a deposit 0.5m thick, and extending 500 m inland (e.g. Williams, 2009).

In a comprehensive set of elevation measurements following the impact of hurricanes at ten sites in the United states, Cahoon (2003, 2006) found ~~Cahoon, 2003, 2006 presented a comprehensive set of measurements in regard to elevation changes following the impact of hurricanes at ten sites in the United States; he found~~ deposition rates ranging from a few cm (e.g. 3 cm after Hurricane Emily, 1993, and Gordon, 1994 for salt marshes in North Carolina), up to around 30 cm (e.g. 28, and 20 cm after Hurricane Andrew, 1992, for salt marshes in Bayou Chitigue, and Old Oyster, Louisiana).

Depending on the net direction of sediment transport, deposits may be laid down over the salt marsh surface or translated seaward. Storms may not, therefore, necessarily leave behind distinct depositional units but instead increase the increment of tidal deposition through elevated suspended sediment concentrations and/or flow velocities (Stumpf, 1983), thus enhancing the usual mechanisms of settling during inundations or over-bank spilling in

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Black close proximity to creeks or the point of tidal ingress. Indeed, Turner et al. (2006, 2007) suggest that large storms increase the supply of mineral matter from offshore via tidal creeks, and have shown that, for Mississippi River salt marshes, the density of minerogenic sediments in salt marsh cores increases ~~in concert~~ with the occurrence of major hurricanes. ~~(Turner et al., 2007).~~

Deposition during storms is readily evidenced where breaching and flooding of the supratidal coastline occurs, e.g. washover deposits or fans. For example, Scileppi and Donnelly (2007) found that washover deposits on the Long Island coast correlate with landfalls of the most intense documented hurricanes, and that periods of increased and decreased landfall incidence can be evidenced in the back-barrier sediment record (~~cf.~~e.g. Liu and Fearn, 2000; Donnelly et al., 2001; 2004). Barrier overwashing during storms can also deposit lobes of sand and intermixed shells over back-barrier salt marshes, where shell beds may then be preserved in the sediment record as an archive of storm washover (Ehlers et al., 1993). Extensive washover deposits resulting from storms have also been found in a back-barrier setting along the Chenier Plain of Louisiana where the intensity of recent hurricanes influences the extent and grain size of the deposits (Williams, 2011).

It is less common for salt marshes to preserve depositional evidence of storms, or at least deposits that can readily be distinguished from the usual background of regular tidal deposition or, indeed, other extreme events such as tsunami (cf. Goff et al., 2004; Morton et al., 2007). Goodbred and Hine (1993) recorded the deposition of a tan to grey unit of clays, silt to very fine sand, and marine biogenic matter across Waccasassa Bay salt marshes in Florida following a 3 m storm surge. The deposit was made up of sedimentary material similar to that of the underlying marsh sediments, indicating a local origin. Proximity to tidal ingress had a significant influence on the thickness of the deposit, increasing from a few cm on the salt marsh surface to as much as 12 cm along creek margins. Generally, severe storms have the potential to deposit distinctive sand units that thin and fine in a landward direction over 100s of meters, that have a sharp basal contact with the underlying salt marsh deposits, and that contain marine microfossils (e.g. Morton and Sallenger, 2003; Turner et al., 2006; Williams, 2009). Such anomalous deposits are characterized using several criteria such as the extent of inundation, landward-thinning and/or landward-fining of the deposit, single or multiple particle size grading, and contained microfossil assemblage (Hawkes and Horton, 2012).

Similar, unconformable sand deposits can be found within the salt marsh sediment record of back-barrier estuaries along the Central Coast of California (e.g. Clarke et al., 2014) where their incidence is connected to barrier breaching and inundation during storms. In this case, high frequency variability in the particle size of such deposits in the back-barrier stratigraphy can be associated with ENSO-driven storms, but where the barrier breaching is most likely due to high river flow as opposed to coastal erosion during storms (Clarke et al., 2017).

Drawing on examples from the longer Holocene sediment record, Haggart (1988) examined the stratigraphic and sedimentary evidence of a tidal surge deposit in two open estuary settings in north-eastern Scotland. This micaceous, silty sand was deposited across pre-existing inter-tidal to perimarine environments, which then returned immediately following its deposition. The stratigraphic evidence is therefore indicative of a high energy environment affecting a wide range of coastal environments simultaneously, with a vertical range of 3.5-5.0 m. Detailed dating, particle size, and paleoecological data reveal this deposit to be marine in origin and virtually instantaneous in its deposition. Similar deposits of this kind are found in a number of estuarine and back-barrier settings in north-east Scotland (Smith et al., 2004) for which the timing, rarity, and run-up (as much as 25 m) are indicative of a tsunami rather than a storm surge. Information on storm-related sediment redistribution across the salt marsh surface can equally come from evidence other than stratigraphic, grain size or palaeoecological data. For example, Rahman et al. (2013) explored down-core trends in radioactive pollution to determine patterns of sedimentation in north-west England. A secondary increase in both ^{241}Am and ^{137}Cs activity in the upper 5-10 cm of salt marsh cores from the Dee was interpreted as the re-deposition of sediments eroded from the salt marsh edge, linked to a severe storm in 1990. In principle, the erosion and redistribution of historical pollutants in industrialized estuaries can also be revealed by the analysis of heavy metals or persistent organic pollutants.

In summary, storm deposits are more readily apparent in back-barrier salt marshes where coastal breaching and overwashing enable the landward penetration of coarse sediment lobes that then appear anomalous against the background of tidal mud deposition. Such deposits also have the potential to be found in more open estuary settings where the storm surge results in the landward transport of coarse marine sediment or increases the potential for the redistribution of eroded material onto the salt marsh surface. Identifying such deposits requires a multi-proxy approach to evidence not only the nature and dynamics of the depositional environment but also the age and origin of the sediments, particularly for reconstructing periods of increased and decreased storminess.

4.4 Deformation

Apart from surface processes of erosion, deposition, and incision, subsurface processes induced by soil compaction or groundwater flow are also an important consequence of storms and storm surges occurrence, and can lead to substantial deformation or changes in marsh elevation.

Soil compaction due to ~~storm surge water~~ sediment layers deposited during storm surges is quite common; water fluxes mainly induced by storm surge events can also cause s~~S~~oil shrinkage or swell~~ can be also caused by an alteration of water fluxes mainly induced by storm surge events.~~ F~~f~~or instance, after hurricane Andrew, 1992, and for salt marshes in Bayou Chitigue, Louisiana, in spite of a 28 cm thick deposit, the total change in elevation was -5cm due to soil compaction (Cahoon, 2006). Similarly, for salt marshes in Cedar Island, North Carolina, the surface erosion due to Hurricane Felix, and Jerry was only -1cm, but the change in elevation due to soil compaction reached -18cm (Cahoon et al., 1999; Cahoon, 2006). ~~Soil shrinkage or swell can be also caused by an alteration of water fluxes mainly induced by storm surge events.~~ According to Hendrickson, 1997, soil shrinkage caused a 13 cm, and 8 cm lowering of the marsh platform for salt marshes in Florida after Hurricane Opal, 1995 and Erin, 1995 respectively. On the contrary, during Hurricane Alberto, 1994, soil swelling caused by the storm surge increase in water content, caused an increase in elevation of 13 cm for the salt marshes in Florida, (Cahoon, 2006).

5. Storms impact on salt marsh sediment budget

A salt marsh is defined not only through the vegetated marsh plain, but by the entire geomorphic complex. This complex includes the adjacent estuarine/marine seabed, tidal marsh channels, intertidal flats, marsh scarps, the marsh plain, and pools within the marsh plain. Though the salt marsh plain can accrete vertically through organic and inorganic sediment accretion, the geomorphic evolution of the other components is influenced by the inorganic sediment budget (e.g. Ganju et al., 2017).

Sources of sediment for coastal salt marshes are diverse, but can broadly be categorized into external sources, from the erosion of neighbouring coasts or seafloor and from riverine sediment discharge, as well as internal sources from sediment resuspension on intertidal mudflats adjacent to the salt marshes or erosion of the marsh edges and tidal channels (Schuerch et al., 2014). All sources can be highly variable in time and space and are often driven by highly energetic events, such as storms causing severe precipitation, storm surges and/or wave setup (Ma et al., 2014; Schuerch et al., 2016).

The transport of sediments to the salt marsh occurs on multiple timescales. Wind-waves, due to diurnal or stronger episodic winds, can mobilize estuarine and intertidal flat sediments, erode marsh scarps, and increase sediment concentrations in the water column (Fagherazzi and Priestas, 2010; Ganju et al. 2013).

Over large and small spatio-temporal scales, the net sediment budget will govern whether the complex is trending towards expansion or contraction. For example, a sediment transport deficit that results in a deepening of the estuary will allow for greater propagation of wave energy towards the marsh scarp, leading to increased thrust and erosion of the scarp. The sediment liberated from the marsh scarp may then deposit elsewhere in the complex, or it may be exported from the entire system through hydrodynamic processes. Inorganic sediment supply is also important for vertical accretion on marsh plains (Reed 1989), though in some environments marshes can subsist entirely on organic production (Turner et al. 2002). Furthermore, where the marsh plain meets the marsh scarp, there is a more delicate balance that is dependent on sediment supply, and morphological features as well; for instance, Redfield (1972) identifies the tendency for slumped blocks of peat to trap sediment, and reconstitute marsh plain through recolonization by vegetation, thereby leading to no net loss of marsh plain. ~~.~~Mariotti and Canestrelli, 2017 modelled the long term (3000 years) morphodynamic of an idealized tidal basin considering organogenic accretion, and biostabilization; they found that a basin-scale sediment budget is necessary to predict marsh erosion, and that under several conditions, edge erosion, not platform drowning is likely to dominate marsh loss.

Storms can have varying effects on sediment supply: in some cases they lead to massive sediment export from the system (Ganju et al. 2013), substantial sediment import (Rosencranz et al. 2016), significant marsh plain deposition (Goodbred and Hine, 1995), or negligible marsh plain deposition (Elsey-Quirk 2106).

Ganju et al. (2013) identified disparate sediment sources and transport mechanisms at two Chesapeake Bay marsh complexes (one stable, one degraded), i.e., tidal processes delivered sediment to the stable marsh while fall and winter storms exported sediment from the degraded marsh. Conversely, Rosencranz et al. (2016) found that a single 3 day storm delivered enough sediment to counteract two months of tidally driven sediment export within a Pacific coast marsh complex.

For a degraded marsh complex in Blackwater, MD, USA, tidal resuspension and advection did not provide sediments, while sustained northwest wind events with a 2-wk return interval were able to both mobilize sediment from open-water areas and export sediments (Ganju et al., 2013, Figure 7b); the orientation of the open-water area was aligned along the northwest-southeast axis, thereby allowing for greater fetch and wind-wave exposure during northwest winds. The ensuing wind-waves both mobilized subaqueous sediments and eroded marsh edges; export was then caused by a regional hydrodynamic response which led to net water export. However, a nearby stable complex (Fishing Bay, MD, USA, Figure 7a) imported sediment due to tidal resuspension/advection and proximity to an estuarine sediment source. There was minimal sediment export during the same aforementioned wind-wave events, due to a lack of open-water area.

In Barnegat Bay, New Jersey (USA) a strong south-to-north gradient in shoreline type and sediment availability leads to a variable response to storm events. Dinner Creek, in the southern portion of the bay, is bordered by undeveloped marsh shoreline and shoals consisting of fine sediment (Miselis et al. 2016; Ganju et al. 2014), while Reedy Creek is surrounded by hardened shorelines and coarse-sediment dominated shoals. Ganju et al. (2017) reported a net sediment import for Dinner Creek and negligible sediment transport in Reedy Creek; cumulative fluxes in response to wind events indicate a direction-dependent response (Figure 7c, d). Both sites export sediment during periods with northwest winds and import sediment during southerly winds, but Dinner Creek imports sediment during easterly winds while Reedy Creek remains neutral (Figure 7c, d). This differential response is likely due to the availability of sediment in the estuary. These results show that the location of a salt marsh plays a strong role in the sediment dynamics during storm events, with varied directional responses. Tidal asymmetry affects the net import/ export of sediments as well. The distortion of the tidal wave may significantly change under storm conditions, hence converting a system which would normally import sediments into a system which export sediments (Schuerch et al., 2014).

Finally, Ganju et al. (2017) synthesized sediment budgets of eight microtidal salt marsh complexes, and demonstrated a relationship between the sediment budget and the unvegetated-vegetated marsh ratio, indicating that sediment deficits are linked to conversion of vegetated marsh portions to open water. Both observational and modelling efforts provide insight into the influence of storms and extreme events on sediment transport to and from salt marshes.

Storms impact on sea level rise resilience

Accelerated sea level rise is challenging the survival of coastal salt marshes, which may decrease in elevation within the tidal frame and eventually be inundated too frequently to support the growth of salt marsh vegetation (Kearney et al., 1988; Day et al., 2000; Schepers et al., 2017). With increasing rates of sea level rise, coastal salt marshes rely on a higher sediment supply in order to vertically adapt to the rising sea level (French, 1993;

Kirwan et al., 2010a; D’Alpaos et al., 2011). Ma et al. (2014), for example, show a decrease in marsh sedimentation rates in the Oosterschelde estuary (NL) after the construction of a storm surge barrier, which markedly reduced the (external) marine sediment delivery, but also show that sedimentation rates are still keeping up with sea level rise due to sediment resuspension on the adjacent intertidal mudflat during storm events.

Although estimates of critical rates of sea level rise for coastal salt marshes around the world indicate a relatively high resilience for many salt marsh sites (Kirwan et al., 2016), all assessments also highlight that the available sediment supply is a key factor for marsh resilience to sea level rise (French, 2006; Kirwan et al., 2010a; D’Alpaos et al., 2011; Schuerch et al., 2013). Furthermore, salt marshes in microtidal regimes were identified as particularly sensitive to a drop in sediment supply under increasing rates of sea level rise, whereas salt marshes in macrotidal regimes are more resilient to high rates of sea level rise and/or reduced sediment supply (Spencer et al., 2016; Kirwan et al., 2010b). While being more susceptible to drowning as a consequence of sea level rise, sedimentation rates on microtidal marshes were also shown to be more responsive to changes in storm activity due to an increase in sediment supply through intertidal sediment resuspension with respect to macrotidal marshes. Kolker et al. (2009), for example, found clear storm signals in the sedimentation records of their microtidal and wave exposed study sites within the Long Island Sound (USA), but a much reduced signal in the neighbouring macrotidal sites.

In this context, elongated periods (decades) of increased storm activity appear as the main driver for sedimentation in excess of local sea level rise rates as shown for a mesotidal salt marsh in the German North Sea (Figure 8; Schuerch et al., 2012). This excess sedimentation significantly contributes to the resilience of the marsh with respect to its vertical performance and its ability to adapt to ~~the ~~future SLR (Schuerch et al., 2013). In the Mississippi Delta, extreme events such as the H~~h~~urricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 were reported to contribute sediment layers of 9-13 and 7 cm, respectively, which is ~~a~~ manifold ~~of~~ the regular annual sedimentation (Horton et al., 2009). Meanwhile, Tweel and Turner (2014) argue that the strongest 2% of extreme events contribute 15% of the sedimentation to the marshes of the Mississippi Delta, whereas the majority of the sedimentation (78%) can be attributed to moderate hurricanes with a landfall barometric pressure between 930 and 960 mb (Tweel and Turner, 2014). In addition to sediment deposition, subsurface processes may, however, dominate the elevation response to storm events in many marshes of the Mississippi Delta (Cahoon, 2006; McKee and Cherry, 2009). Subsurface processes are primarily related to soil organic matter, hence are most relevant in organogenic marshes and less so in minerogenic marshes.

Moderate storm events also appear to be responsible for the majority of marsh sedimentation on the Danish peninsula of Skallingen (Bartholdy et al., 2004), where extreme storm events were shown to increase suspended sediment concentrations within the adjacent tidal basin by a factor of up to 20 due to sediment resuspension on the intertidal mudflats. There, a single extreme event could contribute 7.5% to the annual sediment deposition, whereas a single regularly occurring gale already contributes 71% ~~of this~~ (Bartholdy and Aagard, 2001). The high importance of frequently inundating gale events is in accordance with the modelling study of Schuerch et al. (2013), who suggest that the frequency of storm events is more important for inorganic marsh accretion than their intensity. The explanation for this behaviour is that the frequency distribution of high and extreme water levels decreases exponentially with increasing high water levels (Bartholdy et al., 2004; Schuerch et al., 2013), whereas the sediment resuspension on the intertidal mudflat appears to follow a linear relationship with increasing high water level (Temmerman et al., 2003) or significant wave heights (Fagherazzi and Pristas, 2010). Therefore extreme sediment resuspension events are too rare to make a significant impact. Furthermore, the impact of wave-induced sediment resuspension decreases with increasing water depths during high inundation events (Fagherazzi and Wiberg, 2009; Christiansen et al., 2006).

However, sediment resuspension within the intertidal zone is a highly variable process (Carniello et al., 2016), as it also relies on the sediment composition of the seabed and the presence of benthic biology determining the erosion thresholds and the stability of the seabed (Le Hir et al., 2007; Grabowski et al., 2011). In particular the benthic biological activity (e.g. vegetated seabeds, diatom biofilms, and benthic macrofauna) has the potential to introduce significant spatial and temporal variations in sediment resuspension (Andersen et al., 2001). Locally, and depending on biological activity, the impact of storm events on the sediment supply of coastal salt marshes may therefore be subject to considerable seasonal variations, often with a stronger impact of storm events on sediment supply during the winter months (Temmerman et al., 2003).

During ~~elongated~~ long periods of increased storm activity, which appear to be most effective in increasing sedimentation rates on salt marshes (Figure 8; Schuerch et al., 2012), intertidal sediment resuspension may cause a lowering of the mudflat elevation and potentially conversion to a subtidal flat. In combination with an enhanced vertical growth of the vegetated marsh platform this may lead to an increased mudflat-salt marsh elevation gradient (Le Hir et al., 2007; Mariotti and Fagherazzi, 2010). Incoming waves, therefore, have an increased erosive impact on the steeper marsh edge, hence increasing the marsh’s vulnerability to lateral erosion (e.g. Van de Koppel et al., 2005)). A reduction of the intertidal mudflat area due to storm erosion also reduces the sediment resuspension and therefore the sediment supply for the vertical growth of the salt marsh. Both marsh edge erosion and the vertical performance of coastal salt marshes are therefore critically dependent on external sediment supply, which in fact is often enhanced by storm events as well (Mariotti and Carr, 2014).

The sediment import into the tidal basins of the Wadden Sea (South-eastern North Sea), for example, increases during storm events and the sediment composition shifts into the coarser spectrum as increased erosion takes place along the beaches of the adjacent barrier islands and the ebb-tidal delta (Schuerch et al., 2014). Similarly, increased suspended sediment concentrations are observed along the UK East coast as a consequence of the erosion of soft cliffs, particularly during the winter season and intensified storm periods (McCave, 1987; Nicholls et al., 2000; Dyer and Moffat, 1998). Storm events are also often associated with increased precipitation in the catchments of the rivers draining into the coastal zone. The increased river runoff often increases the sediment delivery into the coastal zone and hence the "external" sediment supply for coastal salt marshes (Schuerch et al., 2016). The relationship between river runoff and sediment delivery is, however, not necessarily a straightforward one as it is subject to intense anthropogenic modifications, such as river damming or land use change in the river catchment (Syvitski et al., 2005).

Despite the abundant field evidence and the well-developed knowledge on the importance of sediment supply for coastal salt marshes, current estimations of future salt marsh development largely neglects the processes and feedbacks involved in storm-related sedimentation by neglecting the temporal variations in sediment supply and assuming a constant sediment supply throughout the coming century (e.g. Kirwan et al., 2010; D'Alpaos et al., 2011; Mariotti and Carr, 2014). Accounting for the storm-induced variability in sediment supply for coastal salt marshes in future models is particularly important as storm activity is known to be subject to significant decadal variability (e.g. driven by the North-Atlantic Oscillation) and may prevent or facilitate the collapse of coastal salt marshes, when conventional modelling under the assumption of constant sediment supply and storm activity would predict differently.

Discussion and Conclusions

In face of climate change, the continued delivery of salt marsh ecosystem services, such as mitigation of flood risks, ~~and shoreline~~ erosion risks, and carbon sequestration, is increasingly important.

Under storm conditions salt marshes are able to effectively dissipate both high water levels and wave energy even under extreme water level conditions, but their ~~such as during storm surges, and even if the wave-bottom interaction, and~~ energy dissipation action decreases with increasing water level. Empirical data and modelling studies demonstrate effective storm surge height reduction behind large ~~(at least 10 km wide)~~ and continuous marshes ~~during moderate storm surges~~, but also point at limitations in the storm surge protection value, when marshes are smaller, and intersected by large channels or open water areas~~, and during extreme storm surges.~~.

~~This implies that storm surge protection schemes should ideally rely on a combination of conservation and restoration of large continuous marsh areas, where space is available, and engineered flood defences, where necessary (Temmerman et al. 2013).~~

~~Under storm surge conditions, up to 60% of the wave attenuation is attributable to the sole presence of vegetation, rather than to the decrease in water depth on the marsh platform relative to the surrounding tidal flat~~The presence of vegetation, and the decrease in water level on the marsh platform both contribute to wave and surge dissipation. ~~(e.g. Moeller et al., 2014).~~ Vegetation properties largely influence this dissipation process; while the more flexible stems tend to flatten during powerful storms (with a reduction in dissipation potential), they are also the more resilient to structural damage, and their flattening helps to protect the marsh substrate against erosion. On the other hand, with increasing wave energy, high vegetation stiffness can enhance the turbulence and surface erosion around plant stems ~~(Silinski et al., 2016; Rupprecht et al., 2017).~~ .

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

Results highlight that there are significant evidences that natural infrastructures such as salt marsh ecosystems, have the potential to enhance coastal resilience. Indeed, in recent years there have been several examples of coastal projects involving natural defences; for instance, in the UK many coastal communities are following manged realignment approaches moving built defences back away from the shoreline to allow natural infrastructures to develop in front of them as a protection (e.g. van Slobbe et al., 2013). In the USA, after hurricane Sandy, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been leading the competition *Rebuild by Design*, which concluded in June 2014 with six winning proposals planning significant hybrid (combined natural, and built defences) components to protect shorelines. Similarly, a project called *PlanNYC* has been developed in New York City for the possible implementation of hybrid coastal protection services (e.g. Sutton-Grier, 2015). Large challenges exist in the identification of best coastal protection options, and there are strengths and weaknesses connected to engineered, as well as natural or hybrid infrastructures (Figure 9). For instance, there is a significant expertise in the design and implementation of built infrastructures, but these provide no co-benefits, can cause habitat losses, and tend to weaken during their life-time. On the other hand, natural infrastructures provide many co-benefits (e.g. carbon sequestration, recreational activities, tourism opportunities), they can strengthen rather than weaken during their lifetime, and possibly adapt to sea level rise; however, they are frequently not ready to be immediately used for coastal protection after their implementation due to the time required for ecosystems establishments, and require large areas to be implemented. Hybrid approaches have the potential to capitalize on best characteristics of both built and natural infrastructures, but can still have some negative impact on the ecosystems with respect to fully natural solutions, and do not provide the same level of co-benefits. We suggest that ideally, coastal protection schemes should rely on a combination of conservation and restoration of large continuous marsh areas when possible, and hybrid solutions where necessary.

Storm action can have various impacts on the geomorphological evolution of salt marshes, and different implications for their long term survival to sea level rise, and climate change in general. Storms impact potentially causes erosion of marsh boundaries, marsh platforms, and surrounding tidal flats, but it might also deliver substantial amount of sediments to the marsh platform.

~~This implies that storm surge protection schemes should ideally rely on a combination of conservation and restoration of large continuous marsh areas, where space is available, and engineered flood defences, where necessary (Temmerman et al. 2013).~~

According to the IPCC (Meehl et al., 2007), it is likely that there will be an increase in peak wind intensities, and near storm precipitations in future cyclones, with an increased occurrence of violent storms in spite of the likely decrease in the total number of storm. ~~Under the assumption of an increase in magnitude, and reduced frequency of extreme events~~ Under these assumptions, it ~~can~~ could be argued that ~~the after-storm impact on~~ marsh boundaries ~~is~~ are expected to be only slightly ~~affected~~ influenced by such changes during immediate after-storm periods; this is because it has been shown that the lateral erosion of salt marshes is mostly dictated by average weather conditions rather than by the ~~extreme events~~most intense storms. On the other hand, ~~T~~the biggest impact that storms could have in relation to lateral salt marsh dynamics could instead be connected to the deepening of tidal flats which promotes higher wave energy at the marsh boundary, and reduces wave energy dissipation by bottom friction, causing therefore an increase in the erosion potential during inter-storms period, i.e. under normal weather conditions.

The impact on the vertical salt marsh dynamic is complicated because, even if more intense storms have the potential to deposit more sediments, there are evidences about the fact that storms frequency is more important than intensity for the long term inorganic accretion of salt marshes. The explanation for this behaviour is that the frequency ~~distribution~~ of very high ~~and~~and extreme water levels decreases exponentially with increasing ~~high water~~ levels, and in the long term large but sporadically occurring sediment deposits might deliver less sediments than relatively small but more frequently occurring deposits ~~-~~(Schuerch et al., 2013, 2014).

The occurrence of storms might then directly or indirectly impact the sediment budget of the coastline. In particular, the direction of storm events can determine whether there is a direct import or export from a coastal embayment. Furthermore, the occurrence of storms is generally connected to precipitation events and surface runoff which might increase the transport of sediments from the catchment to the coastline (e.g. Ganju et al., 2013)

The latter considerations highlight the necessity to focus on the indirect impact that large storms might exert on salt marshes not only in the immediate after storm period, but also in the longer term, and on how their morphological consequences influence the response of the system to normal weather conditions during inter-storm periods. Some of the challenges highlighted from the complexity of the problem also include the necessity to consider salt marsh systems as a whole by adopting an integrated approach, taking into account the marsh tidal flat continuum and by accounting for various sediment sources.

Figures

Figure 1

Percentage changes in Emmanuel's (1995) wind maximum potential intensity (MPI_V) per degree increase in global surface air temperature. Large values of MPIv values are generally associate to enhanced tropical storms activity, and intensity (adapted from Vecchi and Soden, 2007).

Figure 2

Sketch of mechanisms and sediment fluxes possibly responsible for salt marsh vertical and horizontal dynamics. Black dashed box represents an hypothetical control volume for the evaluation of the sediment budget.

Figure 3

Relationship between the attenuation rate of High Water Levels (dHWL/dx) at least 0.4m above the marsh platform, and α_V, i.e. ratio between the over-marsh water volume (Vpl) and the total water volume (Vpl+Vc, i.e. over-marsh water volume + water volume within channels) (adapted from Stark et al., 2016).

Figure 4

Sketch of three different flow regimes, i.e. no vegetation, submerged vegetation, emergent vegetation; different flow profiles, and different sources of turbulence within the flow are present depending on vegetation height with respect to water depth. The dominant source of turbulence is respectively (from left to right) the bed, the top of the canopy (shear layer), and the stem wakes. Figure slightly adapted from Beudin et al., 2017. The figure refer to the development of a coupled wave-flow-vegetation interaction model in COAWST (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2016.12.010).

~~Reduction of total Energy [J m-2] between sand flat, marsh edge and marsh interior for ten representative measurements 'bursts' (adapted from Moeller, 1999).~~

Figure 5

Diagram representative for some of the major ~~morphologic~~ storms impacts ~~of storms~~ on salt marsh morphology~~es~~, their spatial scale, and useful literature references. Morton and Barras, 2011; b) Mariotti and Carr, 2014; c) Mariotti, 2016; d) Fan et al., 2006; e) Scileppi and Donnelly, 2007; f) Williams, 2009; g) Leonardi et al., 2016a,b; h) Leonardi et al., 2014, 2015; i) Barras, 2007, l) Cahoon, 2006; m) Cahoon, 2003; These impact are mainly categorized into the following: Deformation, Erosion, Deposition, and Incision.

Figure 6

A) Contribution of different wind categories to salt marsh erosion (from Leonardi et al., 2016). B) Impact of increasing extreme events frequency on the shape of marsh shorelines

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

(adapted from Leonardi et al., 2014, 2015). Increasing the occurrence of extreme events smooths the marsh shoreline.

Figure 7

Sediment flux response to wind forcing at four wetland complexes, as a function of wind direction (radial position) and speed (outward position). The wind direction indicates direction the wind is coming from. Fishing Bay and Blackwater (Maryland, USA), are adjacent to Chesapeake Bay, but their respective locations relative to sediment sources and external forcing result in disparate sediment transport responses to wind events. Northwest winds export sediment from both sites, but southerly winds allow for sediment import at Fishing Bay due to proximity to a southern sediment source (Ganju et al., 2013). Dinner and Reedy Creeks, in southern and northern Barnegat Bay (New Jersey, USA), respectively, both export sediment during westerly winds, but Dinner Creek imports sediment during strong easterly winds. This is likely due to increased fine sediment availability and undeveloped shoreline in the southern portion of Barnegat Bay, as opposed to coarser sediments and hardened shoreline in northern Barnegat Bay.

Figure 8

(a) ~~(a)~~ Historic marsh elevations in comparison to the development of the mean high water level (MHW) and the mean sea level (MSL) for three cores (S1: high marsh; S2: low marsh; S3: pioneer marsh) from a salt marsh on the German island of Sylt (in the South-eastern North Sea). Deposition dates were derived from ^{210}Pb and ^{137}Cs data (open diamonds). ~~The green shaded area indicates the periods of excess sedimentation during periods of increased storm activity.~~ (b) Comparison of sedimentation rates (stars) at core

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm location S2 with storm frequency (open circles), defined as the number of water levels exceeding 2.4 m above the long-term mean sea level (NN: German ordnance datum). Modified after Schuerch et al. (2012). The green shaded area indicates the periods of excess sedimentation during periods of increased storm activity.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Figure 9 Example of possible Built defences (a), natural defences (b), hybrid defences (c), and some of their strengths and weakness. Figure, and table content adapted from Sutton-Grier et al., 2015 (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.04.006).

Formatted: Font: Bold, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Acknowledgments

The following funding are acknowledged: USGS Federal award No G16AC00455; NERC NE/N015614/1.

References

Andersen, T.J., 2001. Seasonal Variation in Erodibility of Two Temperate, Microtidal Mudflats. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 53(1), 1-12.

Augustin, L.N., Irish, J.L., Lynett, P., 2009. Laboratory and numerical studies of wave damping by emergent and near-emergent wetland vegetation. Coastal Engineering 56, 332–340.

Bacmeister, J.T., Reed, K.A., Hannay, C., Lawrence, P., Bates, S., Truesdale, J.E., Rosenbloom, N. and Levy, M., 2016. Projected changes in tropical cyclone activity under future warming scenarios using a high-resolution climate model. *Climatic Change*, pp.1-14.

Barbier, E. B., Georgiou, I. Y., Enchelmeyer, B., and Reed, D. J., 2013, The Value of Wetlands in Protecting Southeast Louisiana from Hurricane Storm Surges Plos One, v. 8, p. e58715.

Barras, J.A., 2007. *Satellite images and aerial photographs of the effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on coastal Louisiana* (No. 281). Geological Survey (US).

Bartholdy, J. and Aagaard, T., 2001. Storm surge effects on a back-barrier tidal flat of the Danish Wadden Sea. Geo-Marine Letters, 20(3), 133-141.

Bartholdy, J., Christiansen, C. and Kunzendorf, H., 2004. Long term variations in backbarrier salt marsh deposition on the Skallingen peninsula - the Danish Wadden Sea. Marine Geology, 203(1-2), 1-21.

Beudin, A., Kalra, T.S., Ganju, N.K. and Warner, J.C., 2017. Development of a coupled wave-flow-vegetation interaction model. *Computers & Geosciences*, *100*, pp.76-86.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.25 cm, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Bouma, T. J., De Vries, M. B., Low, E., Peralta, G., Tanczos, I., Van de Koppel, J., and Herman, P. M. J., 2005, Trade-offs related to ecosystem-engineering: a case study on stiffness of emerging macrophytes: Ecology, v. 86, p. 2187-2199.

Cahoon, D.R., Day Jr, J.W. and Reed, D.J., 1999. The influence of surface and shallow subsurface soil processes on wetland elevation: A synthesis. *Current topics in wetland biogeochemistry*, *3*, pp.72-88.

Cahoon, D. R. 2003. Storms as agents of wetland elevation change: their impact on surface and subsurface sediment processes, Proceedings of the International Conference on Coastal Sediments 2003. May 18-23, 2003, Clearwater Beach, FL, USA. CD-ROM Published by World Scientific Publishing Corp. and East Meets West Productions, Corpus Christi, Texas, USA. ISBN 981-238-422-7.

Cahoon, D.R., 2006. A review of major storm impacts on coastal wetland elevations. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *29*(6), pp.889-898.

Carniello, L., D'Alpaos, A., Botter, G. and Rinaldo, A.C.J.F., 2016. Statistical characterization of spatiotemporal sediment dynamics in the Venice lagoon. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 121(5), 1049-1064.

Cheong, S. M., Silliman, B., Wong, P. P., van Wesenbeeck, B., Kim, C. K., and Guannel, G., 2013, Coastal adaptation with ecological engineering: Nature Climate Change, v. 3, no. 9, p. 787-791.

Christiansen, T., Wiberg, P.L. and Milligan, T.G., 2000. Flow and sediment transport on a tidal salt marsh surface. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *50*(3), pp.315-331.

Christiansen, C., Vølund, G., Lund-Hansen, L.C. and Bartholdy, J., 2006. Wind influence on tidal flat sediment dynamics: Field investigations in the Ho Bugt, Danish Wadden Sea. Marine Geology, 235(1-4), 75-86.

Clarke, D. W., Boyle, J. F., Plater, A. J. (2017). Particle-size evidence of barrier estuary regime as a new proxy for ENSO climate variability. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, in press. doi:10.1002/esp.4106

Clarke, D. W., Boyle, J. F., Chiverrell, R. C., Lario, J., Plater, A. J. (2014). A sediment record of barrier estuary behaviour at the mesoscale: Interpreting high-resolution particle size analysis. Geomorphology 221, 51-68.

Costanza, R., Perez-Maqueo, O., Martinez, M. L., Sutton, P., Anderson, S. J., and Mulder, K., 2008, The value of coastal wetlands for hurricane protection: Ambio, v. 37, no. 4, p. 241-248.

CPRA, 2012, Louisiana’s Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast: Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority.

D'Alpaos, A., Mudd, S.M. and Carniello, L., 2011. Dynamic response of marshes to perturbations in suspended sediment concentrations and rates of relative sea level rise. Journal of Geophysical Research-Earth Surface, 116(F4), F04020.

D’Alpaos, A. and Marani, M., 2016. Reading the signatures of biologic–geomorphic feedbacks in salt-marsh landscapes. *Advances in Water Resources*, *93*, pp.265-275.

Danielsen, F., Sorensen, K., Olwig, M. F., Selvam, V., Parish, F., Burgess, N. D., Hiraishi, T., Karunagaran, F. M., Rasmussen, M. S., Hansen, L. B., Quarto, A., and Suryadiputra, N., 2005, The Asian Tsunami: a protective role for coastal vegetation: Science, v. 310, p. 643-643.

Day, J., Britsch, L., Hawes, S., Shaffer, G., Reed, D. and Cahoon, D., 2000. Pattern and process of land loss in the Mississippi Delta: A Spatial and temporal analysis of wetland habitat change. Estuaries and Coasts, 23(4), 425-438.

Das, S., and Vincent, J. R., 2009, Mangroves protected villages and reduced death toll during Indian super cyclone: Proceedings of the National Academy of Scieces of the United States of America, v. 106, p. 7357-7360.

Day, J. W., Boesch, D. F., Clairain, E. J., Kemp, G. P., Laska, S. B., Mitsch, W. J., Orth, K., Mashriqui, H., Reed, D. J., Shabman, L., Simenstad, C. A., Streever, B. J., Twilley, R. R., Watson, C. C., Wells, J. T., and Whigham, D. F., 2007, Restoration of the Mississippi delta: lessons from hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Science, v. 315, p. 1679-1684.

Deegan, L. A., Johnson, D. S., Warren, R. S., Peterson, B. J., Fleeger, J. W., Fagherazzi, S., and Wollheim, W. M., 2012, Coastal eutrophication as a driver of salt marsh loss: Nature, v. 490, p. 388-392.

de Groot, A.V., Veeneklaas, R.M. and Bakker, J.P., 2011. Sand in the salt marsh: Contribution of high-energy conditions to salt-marsh accretion. Marine Geology, 282(3-4), 240-254.

Dyer, K.R. and Moffat, T.J., 1998. Fluxes of suspended matter in the East Anglian plume Southern North Sea. Continental Shelf Research, 18(11), 1311-1331.

Dijkema, K.S., 1987. Geography of salt marshes in Europe. Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie N.F. 31 (4), 489-499.

Donnelly, J. P., Roll, S., Wengren, M., Butler, J., Webb III, T. (2001) Sedimentary evidence of intense hurricane strikes from New Jersey. Geology 29, 615–618.

Donnelly, J. P., Butler, J., Roll, S., Wengren, M., Webb III, T. (2004) A backbarrier overwash record of intense storms from Brigantine, New Jersey. Marine Geology 210, 107–121.

Ehlers, J., Nagorny, K., Schmidt, P., Stieve, B., Zietlow, K. (1993) Storm Surge Deposits in North Sea Salt Marshes Dated by 134Cs and 137Cs Determination. Journal of Coastal Research 9(3), 698-701.

Elsey-Quirk, T., 2016. Impact of Hurricane Sandy on salt marshes of New jersey. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *183*, pp.235-248.

Elwany, M., W. O’Reilly, R. Guza, and R. Flick (1995), Effects of Southern California kelp beds on waves, J. Waterw. Port Coastal Ocean Eng.,121(2), 143–150.

Fan, D., Guo, Y., Wang, P. and Shi, J.Z., 2006. Cross-shore variations in morphodynamic processes of an open-coast mudflat in the Changjiang Delta, China: with an emphasis on storm impacts. *Continental Shelf Research*, *26*(4), pp.517-538.

Fagherazzi, S., Carniello, L., D'Alpaos, L. and Defina, A., 2006. Critical bifurcation of shallow microtidal landforms in tidal flats and salt marshes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 103(22), pp.8337-8341.

Fagherazzi, S. and Wiberg, P.L., 2009. Importance of wind conditions, fetch, and water levels on wave-generated shear stresses in shallow intertidal basins. Journal of Geophysical Research, 114(F3), F03022.

Fagherazzi, S. and Priestas, A.M., 2010. Sediments and water fluxes in a muddy coastline: interplay between waves and tidal channel hydrodynamics. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 35(3), 284-293.

Fagherazzi, S., 2013. The ephemeral life of a salt marsh. Geology, 41(8), pp.943-944.

Fagherazzi, S., 2014. Coastal processes: Storm-proofing with marshes. *Nature Geoscience*, *7*(10), p.701.

Foster, N.M., Hudson, M.D., Bray, S. and Nicholls, R.J., 2013. Intertidal mudflat and saltmarsh conservation and sustainable use in the UK: A review. *Journal of environmental management*, *126*, pp.96-104.

French, J.R., 1993. Numerical simulation of vertical marsh growth and adjustment to accelerated sea-level rise, North Norfolk, U.K. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 18(1), 63-81.

French, J., 2006. Tidal marsh sedimentation and resilience to environmental change: Exploratory modelling of tidal, sea-level and sediment supply forcing in predominantly allochthonous systems. Marine Geology, 235(1-4), 119-136.

Ganju, N.K., Defne, Z., Kirwan, M.L., Fagherazzi, S., D'alpaos, A. and Carniello, L., 2017. Spatially integrative metrics reveal hidden vulnerability of microtidal salt marshes. *Nature communications*, *8*.

Ganju, N.K., Miselis, J.L. and Aretxabaleta, A.L., 2014. Physical and biogeochemical controls on light attenuation in a eutrophic, back-barrier estuary. *Biogeosciences*, *11*, pp.7193-7205.

Ganju, N.K., Nidzieko, N.J. and Kirwan, M.L., 2013. Inferring tidal wetland stability from channel sediment fluxes: Observations and a conceptual model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *118*(4), pp.2045-2058.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.25 cm

Ganju, N.K., Schoellhamer, D.H. and Bergamaschi, B.A., 2005. Suspended sediment fluxes in a tidal wetland: Measurement, controlling factors, and error analysis. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *28*(6), pp.812-822.

Goff, J., McFadgen, B.G., Chagué-Goff, C. (2004) Sedimentary differences between the 2002 Easter storm and the 15th-century Okoropunga tsunami, southeastern North Island, New Zealand Marine Geology 204(1–2), 235-250.

Goodbred, S.L. and Hine, A.C., 1995. Coastal storm deposition: Salt-marsh response to a severe extratropical storm, March 1993, west-central Florida. *Geology*, *23*(8), pp.679-682.

Goodbred Jr, S.L., Wright, E.E. and Hine, A.C., 1998. Sea-level change and storm-surge deposition in a late Holocene Florida salt marsh. Journal of Sedimentary Research, 68(2).

Grabowski, R.C., Droppo, I.G. and Wharton, G., 2011. Erodibility of cohesive sediment: The importance of sediment properties. Earth-Science Reviews, 105(3-4), 101-120.

Grinsted, A., Moore, J. C., and Jevrejeva, S., 2013, Projected Atlantic hurricane surge threat from rising temperatures: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, v. 110, no. 14, p. 5369-5373.

Haddad, J., Lawler, S., and Ferreira, C. M., 2016, Assessing the relevance of wetlands for storm surge protection: a coupled hydrodynamic and geospatial framework: Natural Hazards, v. 80, no. 2, p. 839-861.

Haggart, B.A. (1988) The stratigraphy, depositional environment and dating of a possible tidal surge deposit in the Beauly Firth area, northeast Scotland. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 66(3), 215-230.

Hawkes, A.D., Horton, B.P. (2012) Sedimentary record of storm deposits from Hurricane Ike, Galveston and San Luis Islands, Texas, Geomorphology doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.05.017

Heuner, M., Silinski, A., Schoelynck, J., Bouma, T.J., Puijalon, S., Troch, P., Fuchs, E., Schroder, B., Schroder, U., Meire, P., Temmerman, S., 2015. Ecosystem engineering by plants on wave-exposed intertidal flats is governed by relationships between effect and response traits. PLoS One 10, e0138086, http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138086http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138086.

Hartnall, T.J., 1984. Salt-marsh vegetation and micro-relief development on the New Marsh at Gibraltar Point, Lincolnshire. In: Clark, M.W. (Ed.), Coastal Research: UK Perspectives. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 37-58, 131 pp.

Hendrickson, J.C., 1997. *Coastal wetland response to rising sea-level: quantification of short-and long-term accretion and subsidence, northeastern Gulf of Mexico*.

Horton, B.P., Rossi, V. and Hawkes, A.D., 2009. The sedimentary record of the 2005 hurricane season from the Mississippi and Alabama coastlines. Quaternary International, 195(1-2), 15-30.

Hu, K. L., Chen, Q., and Wang, H. Q., 2015, A numerical study of vegetation impact on reducing storm surge by wetlands in a semi-enclosed estuary: Coastal Engineering, v. 95, p. 66-76.

Jiang, P., Yu, Z., Gautam, M.R., Yuan, F. and Acharya, K., 2016. Changes of storm properties in the United States: observations and multimodel ensemble projections. *Global and Planetary Change*, *142*, pp.41-52.

Kearney, M.S., Grace, R.E. and Stevenson, J.C., 1988. Marsh Loss in Nanticoke Estuary, Chesapeake Bay. Geographical Review, 78(2), 205-220.

Kirwan, M.L., Guntenspergen, G.R., D'Alpaos, A., Morris, J.T., Mudd, S.M. and Temmerman, S., 2010a. Limits on the adaptability of coastal marshes to rising sea level. Geophysical Research Letters, 37(23), L23401.

Kirwan, M.L. and Guntenspergen, G.R., 2010b. Influence of tidal range on the stability of coastal marshland. Geophysical Research Letters, 115(F2), F02009.

Kirwan, M.L., Murray, A.B., Donnelly, J.P. and Corbett, D.R., 2011. Rapid wetland expansion during European settlement and its implication for marsh survival under modern sediment delivery rates. *Geology*, *39*(5), pp.507-510.

Kirwan, M.L. and Mudd, S.M., 2012. Response of salt-marsh carbon accumulation to climate change. *Nature*, *489*(7417), p.550.

Kirwan, M.L., Temmerman, S., Skeehan, E.E., Guntenspergen, G.R. and Fagherazzi, S., 2016. Overestimation of marsh vulnerability to sea level rise. Nature Clim. Change, 6(3), 253-260.

Kolker, A.S., Goodbred Jr, S.L., Hameed, S. and Cochran, J.K., 2009. High-resolution records of the response of coastal wetland systems to long-term and short-term sea-level variability. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 84(4), 493-508.

Kobayashi, N., Raichle, A.W. and Asano, T., 1993. Wave attenuation by vegetation. *Journal of waterway, port, coastal, and ocean engineering*, *119*(1), pp.30-48.

Koch, E.W. and Gust, G., 1999. Water flow in tide-and wave-dominated beds of the seagrass Thalassia testudinum. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *184*, pp.63-72.

Krauss, K. W., Doyle, T. W., Doyle, T. J., Swarzenski, C. M., From, A. S., Day, R. H., and Conner, W. H., 2009, Water level observations in mangrove swamps during two hurricanes in Florida: Wetlands, v. 29, no. 1, p. 142-149.

Lawler, S., Haddad, J., and Ferreira, C. M., 2016, Sensitivity considerations and the impact of spatial scaling for storm surge modeling in wetlands of the Mid-Atlantic region: Ocean & Coastal Management, v. 134, p. 226-238.

Lee, M., 2001. Coastal defence and the Habitats Directive: predictions of habitat change in England and Wales. *The Geographical Journal*, *167*(1), pp.39-56.

Le Hir, P., Monbet, Y. and Orvain, F., 2007. Sediment erodability in sediment transport modelling: Can we account for biota effects? Continental Shelf Research, 27(8), 1116-1142.

Leonard, L.A., Hine, A.C., Luther, M.E., Stumpf, R.P. and Wright, E.E., 1995. Sediment transport processes in a west-central Florida open marine marsh tidal creek; the role of tides and extra-tropical storms. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *41*(2), pp.225-248.

Le Hir, P., Roberts, W., Cazaillet, O., Christie, M., Bassoullet, P., Bacher, C., 2000. Characterization of intertidal flat hydrodynamics. Continental Shelf Research 20, 1433-1459.

Leonardi, N. and Fagherazzi, S., 2014. How waves shape salt marshes. *Geology*, *42*(10), pp.887-890.

Leonardi, N. and Fagherazzi, S., 2015. Effect of local variability in erosional resistance on large-scale morphodynamic response of salt marshes to wind waves and extreme events. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *42*(14), pp.5872-5879.

Leonardi, N., Ganju, N.K. and Fagherazzi, S., 2016a. A linear relationship between wave power and erosion determines salt-marsh resilience to violent storms and hurricanes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(1), pp.64-68.

Leonardi, N., Defne, Z., Ganju, N.K. and Fagherazzi, S., 2016b. Salt marsh erosion rates and boundary features in a shallow Bay. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *121*(10), pp.1861-1875.

Liu, K., Fearn, M.L. (2000) Reconstruction of prehistoric landfall frequencies of catastrophic hurricanes in northwestern Florida from lake sediment records. Quaternary Research 54, 238–245.

Liu, Y., Weisberg, R.H., Vignudelli, S., Roblou, L. and Merz, C.R., 2012. Comparison of the X-TRACK altimetry estimated currents with moored ADCP and HF radar observations on the West Florida Shelf. Advances in Space Research, 50(8), pp.1085-1098.

Liu, H. Q., Zhang, K. Q., Li, Y. P., and Xie, L., 2013, Numerical study of the sensitivity of mangroves in reducing storm surge and flooding to hurricane characteristics in southern Florida: Continental Shelf Research, v. 64, p. 51-65.

Loder, N. M., Irish, J. L., Cialone, M. A., and Wamsley, T. V., 2009, Sensitivity of hurricane surge to morphological parameters of coastal wetlands: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 84, no. 4, p. 625-636.

Lovelace, J. K., 1994, Storm-tide elevations produced by Hurricane Andrew along the Louisiana coast, August 25-27, 1992, Open File Report 94-371.

Luhar, M., Nepf, H.M., 2016. Wave-induced dynamics of flexible blades. J. Fluid Struct. 61, 20–41.

Luhar, M., Coutu, S., Infantes, E., Fox, S. and Nepf, H., 2010. Wave-induced velocities inside a model seagrass bed. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *115*(C12).

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto, Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Plain Text, Left

Ma, Z., Ysebaert, T., van der Wal, D., de Jong, D.J., Li, X. and Herman, P.M.J., 2014. Long-term salt marsh vertical accretion in a tidal bay with reduced sediment supply. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 146, 14-23.

Marani, M., d'Alpaos, A., Lanzoni, S. and Santalucia, M., 2011. Understanding and predicting wave erosion of marsh edges. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *38*(21).

Mariotti, G. and Fagherazzi, S., 2010. A numerical model for the coupled long-term evolution of salt marshes and tidal flats. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *115*(F1).

Mariotti, G. and Fagherazzi, S., 2013. Critical width of tidal flats triggers marsh collapse in the absence of sea-level rise. *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, *110*(14), pp.5353-5356.

Mariotti, G. and Carr, J., 2014. Dual role of salt marsh retreat: Long-term loss and short-term resilience. *Water Resources Research*, *50*(4), pp.2963-2974.

Mariotti, G., 2016. Revisiting salt marsh resilience to sea level rise: Are ponds responsible for permanent land loss?. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *121*(7), pp.1391-1407.

Mariotti, G. and Canestrelli, A., Long-term morphodynamics of muddy backbarrier basins: Fill in or empty out?. Water Resources Research, DOI: 10.1002/2017WR020461

Marsooli, R., Orton, P. M., Georgas, N., and Blumberg, A. F., 2016, Three-dimensional hydrodynamic modeling of coastal flood mitigation by wetlands: Coastal Engineering, v. 111, p. 83-94.

Formatted: Font: No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.25 cm, Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font:

McGee, B. D., Goree, B. B., Tollet, R. W., Woodward, B. K., and Kress, W. H., 2006, Hurricane Rita surge data, Southwestern Louisiana and Southeastern Texas, September-November 2005: US Geological Survey.

McCave, I.N., 1987. Fine sediment sources and sinks around the East Anglian Coast (UK). Journal of the Geological Society, 144(1), 149-152.

McKee, K.L. and Cherry, J.A., 2009. Hurricane Katrina sediment slowed elevation loss in subsiding brackish marshes of the Mississippi River delta. Wetlands, 29(1), 2-15.

Meire, P., Dauwe, W., Maris, T., Peeters, P., Coen, L., Deschamps, M., Rutten, J., and Temmerman, S., 2014, Sigma plan proves efficiency: ECSA Bulletin, v. 62, p. 19-23.

Meehl, G.A., T.F. Stocker, W.D. Collins, P. Friedlingstein, A.T. Gaye, J.M. Gregory, A. Kitoh, R. Knutti, J.M. Murphy, A. Noda, S.C.B. Raper, I.G. Watterson, A.J. Weaver and Z.-C. Zhao, 2007: Global Climate Projections. In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Mendez, F. J., and I. J. Losada (2004), An empirical model to estimate the propagation of random breaking and non-breaking waves over vegetation fields, Coastal Eng. , 51, 103–118, doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2003.11.003.

Miselis, J.L., Andrews, B.D., Nicholson, R.S., Defne, Z., Ganju, N.K. and Navoy, A., 2016. Evolution of mid-Atlantic coastal and back-barrier estuary environments in response to a hurricane: Implications for barrier-estuary connectivity. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *39*(4), pp.916-934.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, No underline, Font color: Auto, Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm, Line spacing: single, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and

Möller, I., T. Spencer, J.R. French, D.J. Leggett, and M. Dixon (1999), Wave transformation over salt marshes: a field and numerical modelling study from North Norfolk, England. Estuarine Coastal Shelf Science 49: 411–426.

Moller I. 2006. Quantifying saltmarsh vegetation and its effect on wave height dissipation: results from a UK east coast saltmarsh. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 69:337–51.

Möller, I., Kudella, M., Rupprecht, F., Spencer, T., Paul, M., Van Wesenbeeck, B.K., Wolters, G., Jensen, K., Bouma, T.J., Miranda-Lange, M. and Schimmels, S., 2014. Wave attenuation over coastal salt marshes under storm surge conditions. *Nature Geoscience*, *7*(10), pp.727-731.

Morton, R.A., Sallenger, A.H., 2003. Morphological impacts of extreme storms on sandy beaches and barriers. Journal of Coastal Research 19, 560–573.

Morton, R.A., Gelfenbaum, G., Jaffe, B.E. (2007) Physical criteria for distinguishing sandy tsunami and storm deposits using modern examples. Sedimentary Geology 200 (3–4), 184-207

Morton, R.A. and Barras, J.A., 2011. Hurricane impacts on coastal wetlands: A half-century record of storm-generated features from southern Louisiana. *Journal of Coastal Research*, *27*(6A), pp.27-43.

Mudd, S.M., Howell, S.M. and Morris, J.T., 2009. Impact of dynamic feedbacks between sedimentation, sea-level rise, and biomass production on near-surface marsh stratigraphy and carbon accumulation. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *82*(3), pp.377-389.

Mullarney, J.C., Henderson, S.M. (2010), Wave-forced motion of submerged single-stem vegetation, J. Geophys. Res., 115, C12061, doi:10.1029/2010JC006448.

Murray, A.L. and Spencer, T., 1997. On the wisdom of calculating annual material budgets in tidal wetlands. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *150*, pp.207-216.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.25 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm

Nicholls, R.J., Dredge, A. and Wilson, T., 2000. Shoreline change and fine-grained sediment input: Isle of Sheppey Coast, Thames Estuary, UK. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 175(1), 305-315.

Neumeier, U., Ciavola, P., 2004. Flow resistance and associated sedimentary processes in a Spartina maritima salt-marsh. J. Coast. Res. 20, 435–447.

Paul, M., Bouma, T.J., Amos, C.L., 2012. Wave attenuation by submerged vegetation: combining the effect of organism traits and tidal current. Marine Ecology-Progress Series 444, 31–41.

Paul, M., Rupprecht, F., Möller, I., Bouma, T.J., Spencer, T., Kudella, M., Wolters, G., van Wesenbeeck, B.K., Jensen, K., Miranda-Lange, M., Schimmels, S., 2016. Plant stiffness and biomass as drivers for drag forces under extreme wave loading: a flume study on mimics. Coast. Eng. 117, 70–78.

Pachauri, R.K., Allen, M.R., Barros, V.R., Broome, J., Cramer, W., Christ, R., Church, J.A., Clarke, L., Dahe, Q., Dasgupta, P. and Dubash, N.K., 2014. *Climate change 2014: synthesis report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (p. 151). IPCC.

Pendleton, L., Donato, D.C., Murray, B.C., Crooks, S., Jenkins, W.A., Sifleet, S., Craft, C., Fourqurean, J.W., Kauffman, J.B., Marbà, N. and Megonigal, P., 2012. Estimating global “blue carbon” emissions from conversion and degradation of vegetated coastal ecosystems. PloS one, 7(9), p.e43542.

Peralta, G., van Duren, L.A., Morris, E.P., Bouma, T.J., 2008. Consequences of shoot density and stiffness for ecosystem engineering by benthic macrophytes in flow dominated areas: a hydrodynamic flume study. Mar. Ecol.—Prog. Ser. 368, 103–115.

Pethick, J.S., 1992. Saltmarsh geomorphology. In: Allen, J.R.L., Pye, K. (Eds.), Saltmarshes. Morphodynamics, Conservation and Engineering Significance. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 41-62.

Puijalon, S., Bouma, T.J., Douady, C.J., van Groenendael, J., Anten, N.P.R., Martel, E., Bornette, G., 2011. Plant resistance to mechanical stress: evidence of an avoidance-tolerance trade-off. New Phytolologist, 191, pp. 1141–1149.

Priestas, A.M., Mariotti, G., Leonardi, N. and Fagherazzi, S., 2015. Coupled wave energy and erosion dynamics along a salt marsh boundary, Hog Island Bay, Virginia, USA. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, *3*(3), pp.1041-1065.

Rahman, R., Plater, A. J., Nolan, P. J., Mauz, B., Appleby, P. G. (2013). Potential health risks from radioactive contamination of saltmarshes in NW England. Journal of Environmental Radioactivity 119, 55-62.

Redfield, A.C., 1972. Development of a New England salt marsh. *Ecological monographs*, *42*(2), pp.201-237.

Reed, D.J., 1989. Patterns of sediment deposition in subsiding coastal salt marshes, Terrebonne Bay, Louisiana: the role of winter storms. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *12*(4), pp.222-227.

Reed, D.J., 2002. Understanding tidal marsh sedimentation in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. *California. Journal of Coastal Research Special*, (36), pp.605-611.

Resio, D. T., and Westerink, J. J., 2008, Modelling the physics of storm surges: Physics Today, v. 61, no. 9, p. 33-38.

Riffe, K. C., S. M. Henderson, and J. C. Mullarney (2011), Wave dissipation by flexible vegetation, Geophysical Research Letters, 38,p. L18607, doi:10.1029/2011GL048773.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.5 cm, Line spacing: Double

Rosencranz, J.A., Ganju, N.K., Ambrose, R.F., Brosnahan, S.M., Dickhudt, P.J., Guntenspergen, G.R., MacDonald, G.M., Takekawa, J.Y. and Thorne, K.M., 2016. Balanced Sediment Fluxes in Southern California's Mediterranean-Climate Zone Salt Marshes. Estuaries and Coasts, 39(4), pp.1035-1049.

Rupprecht, F., Moller, I., Evans, B., Spencer, T., and Jensen, K., 2015, Biophysical properties of salt marsh c anopies Quantifying plant stern flexibility and above ground biomass: Coastal Engineering, v. 100, p. 48-57.

Rupprecht, F., Möller, I., Paul, M., Kudella, M., Spencer, T., van Wesenbeeck, B. K., ... & Schimmels, S. (2017). Vegetation-wave interactions in salt marshes under storm surge conditions. Ecological Engineering, 100, 301-315.

Schepers, L., Kirwan, M. L., Guntenspergen, G. R., and Temmerman, S., 2017, Spatio-temporal development of vegetation die-off in a submerging coastal marsh: Limnology and Oceanography, v. 62, p. 137-150.

Schuerch, M., Rapaglia, J., Liebetrau, V., Vafeidis, A. and Reise, K., 2012. Salt Marsh Accretion and Storm Tide Variation: an Example from a Barrier Island in the North Sea. Estuaries and Coasts, 35(2), 486-500.

Schuerch, M., Vafeidis, A., Slawig, T. and Temmerman, S., 2013. Modeling the influence of changing storm patterns on the ability of a salt marsh to keep pace with sea level rise. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 118(1), 84-96.

Schuerch, M., Dolch, T., Reise, K. and Vafeidis, A.T., 2014. Unravelling interactions between salt marsh evolution and sedimentary processes in the Wadden Sea (southeastern North Sea). Progress in Physical Geography, 38(6), 691-715.

Schuerch, M., Scholten, J., Carretero, S., García-Rodríguez, F., Kumbier, K., Baechtiger, M. and Liebetrau, V., 2016. The effect of long-term and decadal climate and hydrology variations on estuarine marsh dynamics: An identifying case study from the Río de la Plata. Geomorphology, 269, 122-132.

Schwimmer, R.A., 2001. Rates and processes of marsh shoreline erosion in Rehoboth Bay, Delaware, USA. *Journal of Coastal Research*, pp.672-683.

Scileppi, E. and Donnelly, J.P., 2007. Sedimentary evidence of hurricane strikes in western Long Island, New York. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, *8*(6).

Scileppi, E., Donnelly, J.P. (2007) Sedimentary evidence of hurricane strikes in western Long Island, New York. Geochemistry, Geophysics and Geosystems 8(6), Q06011, doi:10.1029/2006GC001463

Sheng, Y. P., Lapetina, A., and Ma, G. F., 2012, The reduction of storm surge by vegetation canopies: Three-dimensional simulations: Geophysical Research Letters, v. 39.

Silinski, A., Heuner, M., Schoelynck, J., Puijalon, S., Schroder, U., Fuchs, E., Troch, P., Bouma, T.J., Meire, P., Temmerman, S., 2015. Effects of wind waves versus ship waves on tidal marsh plants: a flume study on different life stages of Scirpus maritimus. PLoS One 10, e0118687, http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.ponehttp://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone. 0118687.

Smith, D.E., Shi, S., Cullingford, R.A., Dawson, A.G., Dawson, S., Firth, C.R., Foster, I.D.L., Fretwell, P.T., Haggart, B.A. Holloway, L.K., Long, D. (2004) The Holocene Storegga Slide tsunami in the United Kingdom Quaternary Science Reviews 23(23–24), 2291-2321.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm

Smolders, S., Plancke, Y., Ides, S., Meire, P., and Temmerman, S., 2015, Role of intertidal wetlands for tidal and storm tide attenuation along a confined estuary: a model study: Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, v. 15, p. 1659–1675.

Sobel, A.H., Held, I.M. and Bretherton, C.S., 2002. The ENSO signal in tropical tropospheric temperature. *Journal of Climate*, *15*(18), pp.2702-2706.

~~Solomon, S. ed., 2007. *Climate change 2007-the physical science basis: Working group I contribution to the fourth assessment report of the IPCC* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.~~

Spencer, T., Brooks, S.M., Evans, B.R., Tempest, J.A. and Möller, I., 2015. Southern North Sea storm surge event of 5 December 2013: water levels, waves and coastal impacts. *Earth-Science Reviews*, *146*, pp.120-145.

Spencer, T., Moller, I., Rupprecht, F., Bouma, T.J., van Wesenbeeck, B.K., Kudella, M., Paul, M., Jensen, K., Wolters, G., Miranda-Lange, M., Schimmels, S., 2016. Salt marsh surface survives true-to-scale simulated storm surges. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms. DOI:10.1002/esp.3867.

Spencer, T., Schuerch, M., Nicholls, R.J., Hinkel, J., Lincke, D., Vafeidis, A.T., Reef, R., McFadden, L. and Brown, S., 2016. Global coastal wetland change under sea-level rise and related stresses: The DIVA Wetland Change Model. Global and Planetary Change, 139, 15-30.

Stark, J., Plancke, Y., Ides, S., Meire, P., and Temmerman, S., 2016, Coastal flood protection by a combined nature-based and engineering approach: modeling the effects of marsh geometry and surrounding dikes: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 175, p. 34-45.

Stark, J., Van Oyen, T., Meire, P., and Temmerman, S., 2015, Observations of tidal and storm surge attenuation in a large tidal marsh: Limnology and Oceanography, v. 60, no. 4, p. 1371-1381.

Stevenson, J.C., Kearney, M.S. and Pendleton, E.C., 1985. Sedimentation and erosion in a Chesapeake Bay brackish marsh system. *Marine Geology*, *67*(3-4), pp.213-235.

Stumpf, R.P. (1983) The process of sedimentation on the surface of a salt marsh. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 17(5), 495-508.

Sutton-Grier, A. E., Wowk, K., and Bamford, H., 2015, Future of our coasts: The potential for natural and hybrid infrastructure to enhance the resilience of our coastal communities, economies and ecosystems: Environmental Science & Policy, v. 51, p. 137-148.

Syvitski, J.P.M., Vörösmarty, C.J., Kettner, A.J. and Green, P., 2005. Impact of Humans on the Flux of Terrestrial Sediment to the Global Coastal Ocean. Science, 308(5720), 376-380.

Temmerman, S., Govers, G., Meire, P. and Wartel, S., 2003. Modelling long-term tidal marsh growth under changing tidal conditions and suspended sediment concentrations, Scheldt estuary, Belgium. Marine Geology, 193(1-2), 151-169.

Temmerman, S. et al. Ecosystem-based coastal defence in the face of global change. Nature 504, 79–83 (2013).

Temmerman, S., De Vries, M. B., and Bouma, T. J., 2012, Coastal marsh die-off and reduced attenuation of coastal floods: a model analysis: Global and Planetary Change, v. 92-93, p. 267-274.

Temmerman, S., and Kirwan, M. L., 2015, Building land with a rising sea: Science, v. 349, no. 6248, p. 588-589.

Temmerman, S., Meire, P., Bouma, T. J., Herman, P. M. J., Ysebaert, T., and De Vriend, H. J., 2013, Ecosystem-based coastal defence in the face of global change: Nature, v. 504, p. 79-83.

Tonelli, M., Fagherazzi, S. and Petti, M., 2010. Modeling wave impact on salt marsh boundaries. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *115*(C9).

Turner, R.E., Baustian, J.J., Swenson, E.M., Spicer, J.S. (2006) Wetland sedimentation from hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Science 314, 449–452.

Turner, R.E., Swenson, E.M., Milan, C.S., Lee J.M. (2007) Hurricane signals in salt marsh sediments: Inorganic sources and soil volume. Limnology and Oceanography 52(3), 1231–1238.

Tweel, A.W. and Turner, R.E., 2014. Contribution of tropical cyclones to the sediment budget for coastal wetlands in Louisiana, USA. Landscape Ecology, 29(6), 1083-1094.

USACE, 1963, Interim survey report, Morgan city, Louisiana and vicinity, serial no. 63: US Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans.

Van de Koppel, J., Van der Wal, D., Bakker, J. P., and Herman, P. M. J., 2005, Self-organisation and vegetation collapse in salt marsh ecosystems: The American Naturalist, v. 165, no. 1, p. E1-E12.

Van Slobbe, E., de Vriend, H.J., Aarninkhof, S., Lulofs, K., de Vries, M. and Dircke, P., 2013. Building with Nature: in search of resilient storm surge protection strategies. Natural hazards, 66(3), pp.1461-1480.

Van Wesenbeeck, B., Mulder, J. P. M., Marchand, M., Reed, D. J., De Vries, M. B., De Vriend, H. J., and Herman, P. M. J., 2014, Damming deltas: a practice of the past? Towards nature-based flood defenses: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 140, p. 1-6.

Formatted: Font: No underline, Font color: Auto, English (United States)

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline, Font color: Auto, English (United States)

Formatted: Font: No underline, Font color: Auto, English (United States)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline, Font color: Auto, English (United States)

Formatted: Font: No underline, Font color: Auto, English (United States)

Formatted: English (United States), Check spelling and grammar

Vecchi, G.A. and Soden, B.J., 2007. Increased tropical Atlantic wind shear in model projections of global warming. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *34*(8).

Wamsley, T. V., Cialone, M. A., Smith, J. M., Atkinson, J. H., and Rosati, J. D., 2010, The potential of wetlands in reducing storm surge: Ocean Engineering, v. 37, no. 1, p. 59-68.

Wamsley, T. V., Cialone, M. A., Smith, J. M., Ebersole, B. A., and Grzegorzewski, A. S., 2009, Influence of landscape restoration and degradation on storm surge and waves in southern Louisiana: Natural Hazards, v. 51, p. 207-224.

Webster, P.J., Holland, G.J., Curry, J.A. and Chang, H.R., 2005. Changes in tropical cyclone number, duration, and intensity in a warming environment. *Science*, *309*(5742), pp.1844-1846.

Williams, H.F., 2009. Stratigraphy, sedimentology, and microfossil content of Hurricane Rita storm surge deposits in southwest Louisiana. *Journal of Coastal Research*, pp.1041-1051.

Williams, H.F.L. (2011). Stratigraphic Record of Hurricanes Audrey, Rita and Ike in the Chenier Plain of Southwest Louisiana. Journal of Coastal Research SI 64, 1921-1926.

Woodruff, J. D., Irish, J. L., and Camargo, S. J., 2013, Coastal flooding by tropical cyclones and sea-level rise: Nature, v. 504, p. 44-52.

Woth, K., Weisse, R. and Von Storch, H., 2006. Climate change and North Sea storm surge extremes: an ensemble study of storm surge extremes expected in a changed climate projected by four different regional climate models. *Ocean Dynamics*, *56*(1), pp.3-15.

Yang, S.L., Shi, B.W., Bouma, T.J., Ysebaert, T., Luo, X.X., 2012. Wave attenuation at a salt marsh margin: a case study of an exposed coast on the Yangtze Estuary. Estuaries Coasts 35, 169– 182.

Zhang, K., Douglas, B.C. and Leatherman, S.P., 2000. Twentieth-century storm activity along the US east coast. *Journal of Climate*, *13*(10), pp.1748-1761.

Zhang, K. Q., Liu, H. Q., Li, Y. P., Xu, H. Z., Shen, J., Rhome, J., and Smith, T. J., 2012, The role of mangroves in attenuating storm surges: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 102, p. 11-23.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.25 cm

Dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes: a review

Nicoletta Leonardi (a*), Iacopo Carnacina (b), Carmine Donatelli (a), Neil Kamal Ganju (c), Andrew James Plater (a), Mark Schuerch (d), Stijn Temmerman (e)

* Corresponding author nicleona@liverpool.ac.uk

(a) University of Liverpool, Department of Geography and Planning, 74 Bedford St S. Liverpool, UK

(b) Liverpool John Moores University, Department of Civil Engineering, Peter Jost Enterprise Centre, Byrom Street, Liverpool, L3 3AF

(c) U.S. Geological Survey, Woods Hole Coastal and Marine Science Center, MA 02543, USA

(d) Cambridge Coastal Research Unit (CCRU) Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge, CB2 3EN, United Kingdom

(e) Ecosystem Management Research Group, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

Abstract

This manuscript reviews the progresses made in the understanding of the dynamic interactions between coastal storms and salt marshes, including the dissipation of extreme water levels and wind waves across marsh surfaces, the geomorphic impact of storms on salt marshes, the preservation of hurricanes signals and deposits into the sedimentary records, and the importance of storms for the long term survival of salt marshes to sea level rise. A review of weaknesses, and strengths of coastal defences incorporating the use of salt marshes including natural, and hybrid infrastructures in comparison to standard built solutions is then presented.

Salt marshes are effective in dissipating wave energy, and storm surges, especially when the marsh is highly elevated, and continuous. This buffering action reduces for storms lasting more than one day. Storm surge attenuation rates range from 1.7 to 25 cm/km depending on marsh and storms characteristics. In terms of vegetation properties, the more flexible stems tend to flatten during powerful storms, and to dissipate less energy but they are also more resilient to structural damage, and their flattening helps to protect the marsh surface from erosion, while stiff plants tend to break, and could increase the turbulence level and the scour. From a morphological point of view, salt marshes are generally able to withstand violent storms without collapsing, and violent storms are responsible for only a small portion of the long term marsh erosion.

Our considerations highlight the necessity to focus on the *indirect* long term impact that large storms exerts on the whole marsh complex rather than on sole after-storm periods. The morphological consequences of storms, even if not dramatic, might in fact influence the response of the system to normal weather conditions during following inter-storm periods. For instance, storms can cause tidal flats deepening which in turn promotes wave energy

propagation, and exerts a long term detrimental effect for marsh boundaries even during calm weather. On the other hand, when a violent storm causes substantial erosion but sediments are redistributed across nearby areas, the long term impact might not be as severe as if sediments were permanently lost from the system, and the salt marsh could easily recover to the initial state.

1. Introduction

1.1 Changing storm activity

Many coastal areas are experiencing a change in both extreme and mean storm conditions as a consequence of a changing climate (e.g. Zhang et al., 2000; Webster et al., 2005; Bacmeister et al., 2016). For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (e.g. Solom et al., 2007; Pachauri et al., 2014) it is virtually certain (99-100% probability) that the intensity of cyclone activity has increased in the North Atlantic since 1970, even if there is low confidence that the long term changes are robust. In terms of extremes, it is likely (66-100% probability) that extreme sea levels such as the ones experienced during storm surges have increased since 1970 on a global average. The latter trend has been mainly attributed to an increase in mean sea level even if more studies are necessary to fully separate the effect of global mean sea level rise from the effects of more local modifications to the coastal systems (e.g. Pachauri et al., 2014).

Evaluations of future increases in storms and hurricanes activity are complex, and with large uncertainties. For example, a statistical correlation has been found between the power dissipation index of hurricanes (i.e. an index combining intensity, frequency and duration of hurricanes) and Atlantic Sea Surface Temperature (SST) (e.g. Vecchi et al., 2008). Based on this relationship and taking into account hurricanes activity since 1950, as well as future SST projection, there should be a 300% increase in hurricanes activity by the late 21st century. However, a statistical correlation has been also found between the power dissipation index and the Atlantic sea surface temperature relative to the Tropical mean sea temperature; if the latter relationship is considered, the projected change in hurricane activity by 2100 would be around 25%, which is modest with respect to the estimation above (Vecchi et al., 2008). Projections about the future of hurricanes activity might get even more complicated when looking at the longer term. Mean air temperature, Atlantic SST and the unadjusted hurricanes count all show a marked increase since the late 1800; however, when the raw hurricane count is adjusted for the storms which were not counted during the pre-satellite era due to technology, and ship track density limitations, no significant increase is observed (e.g. Vecchi et al., 2008). Generally, according to the IPCC (Meehl et al., 2007), it is likely that there will be an increase in peak wind intensities, and near storm precipitations in future cyclones, with an increased occurrence of violent storms in spite of the likely decrease in the total number of storm.

Figure 1 illustrates model results in relation to the 21st century changes in Emmanuel's (1995) wind maximum potential intensity (MPI_V), the increase of which is generally associated with an increase in storms activity and intensity (Vecchi and Sobel, 2007). Results refer to the IPCC-AR4 Scenario A1B for the period from June-November. The MPIv index increases over most of the northern hemisphere and tropical zone of the southern hemisphere, but there are also large areas particularly in the southern hemisphere indicating decreases. The regions where the MPI_V decreases are associated with a relative minimum in SST (e.g. Sobel et al., 2002).

On a regional scale, by using a barotropic type surge model and global conditions representative of the IPCC A2 SRES scenarios between 1961-1990 and 2071-2100, it was shown that storm surge extremes may significantly increase along most of the North Sea coast toward the end of this century (Woth et al., 2006). Ensemble simulation runs using Regional Climate Models for various locations in the United States (Jiang et al., 2016) also support the hypothesis of variations in future storm pattern; specifically, they predict shorter storm durations, longer inter-storms periods, and higher storms intensities.

In spite of the abundance of studies in relation to climatic projections and past trends, many challenges are still present, especially for the monitoring of coastal zones, due to limitations of some current modelling and field practice frameworks. For instance, the retrieval of waves and winds in the coastal areas is not yet as mature as sea level measurements, and the development of a wider applicability of altimetry techniques could be relevant for the simultaneous monitoring of wave height, wind speed and sea levels. In this context, Liu et al. 2012 showed the potential usefulness of the 1-Hz along-track altimetry data for the description of shelf areas, and Passaro et al., 2015 showed that estimations of wave height form ALES (Adaptive Leading Edge Sub-waveform retracker) were better correlated to buoy data than processed products. Such techniques could be coupled to standard modelling, and field data approach to build a more comprehensive and homogeneous database for the study of these coastal ecosystems

1.2. Pressures on salt marsh ecosystems

Salt marshes are important coastal ecosystems frequently fringing the interior of estuaries and bays, and establishing in low-energy inter-tidal zones. Due to their location and vegetated surfaces, salt marshes offer several ecosystem services. For example, their value for buffering against the impact of storms has been estimated up to 5 million USD per km^2 in the United States (e.g., Costanza et al., 2008), and 786 million GBP per year for UK marshes (UK National Ecosystem assessment, 2011; Foster et al., 2013; Moller et al., 2014). Indeed, there has been a rapidly increasing body of scientific literature on storm surge attenuation by salt marshes, and growing societal interest in so-called ecosystem-based or nature-based flood defence programs, i.e. marsh and mangrove restoration projects aiming to mitigate storm surge flood risks (e.g. Cheong et al., 2013; Sutton-Grier et al., 2015; Fagherazzi, 2014; Temmerman et al., 2013).

Apart from flood protection, other salt marsh services include the storage of sediments, pollutants, nutrients, as well as of large amounts of carbon at a geological time scale (e.g. Mudd, et al., 2009; Kirwan and Mudd, 2012; Pendleton et al., 2012). They are also the natural habitat of many plants and animal communities, and offer a place for recreational and touristic activities (e.g. Barbier et al., 2011).

The long-term persistence of salt marshes appears related to the maintenance of a delicate balance between sediment and nutrient inputs, and external agents such as wave energy, storm surges, tidal inundation, and sea level rise (e.g. Spencer et al., 1998; Plater et al., 1999; van de Koppel et al., 2005; Deegan et al., 2012; Fagherazzi et al., 2012; Kirwan et al., 2016; Leonardi et al., 2016). Figure 2 represents a sketch of some of the main physical and ecological processes acting on a salt marsh. This includes, for instance, the exchange of sediments between the tidal flat and the marsh platform, biomass production and sediment deposition on the marsh platform promoting vertical accretion, and possible erosion/ progradation of the marsh edge. Ultimately, the survival of salt marshes has been related to a sediment budget problem (Ganju et al., 2017).

Salt marshes have been found to be extremely vulnerable, and large salt marsh losses have been documented worldwide. For instance, for areas in the south west of the Netherlands and the Wadden Sea, marsh edge erosion rates up to 4 m/yr have been observed, in spite of vertical accretion rates in balance with sea level rise (e.g., Bakker et al., 1993). In England and Wales salt marsh areal loss has been estimated to be around 83 ha yr^{-1} (Environment Agency, 2011; Foster et al., 2013), 105 ha yr^{-1} for the period in between 1993 and 2013 (Pye and French, 1993), and is projected to be 349 ha yr^{-1} for the period between 1998 and 2048 (Lee, 2001). In the Greater Thames area, the erosion was estimated to be around 25% of the total area present in 1973 (Cooper et al., 2009), while in the Solent (UK) 40% of the total salt marsh area present in 1971 was eroded between 1971 and 2001 (Cope et al., 2008). Erosion up to 80 cm/yr has been recently measured in the northern part of the Venice Lagoon (e.g., Bendoni et al., 2016). For the East Coast of the United States, in Plum Sound and the Virginia Coast Reserve, salt marsh boundary erosion rates ranged from a couple of cm up to 3 m/yr over a 7-year measuring period (Leonardi and Fagherazzi, 2014, 2015). In Barnegat Bay, New Jersey, USA, erosion rates from 1930 to 2007, and from 2007 to 2013, were similar, with around half of the marsh area that fringes the interior of the bay eroding less than 0.5 m/yr, the other half displaying erosion rates up to 2 m/yr, and only a 3 percent eroding faster than 2 m/yr (Leonardi et al., 2016b). A recent global analysis on salt marsh erosion and wave measurements by Leonardi et al., 2016a revealed that most of salt marsh deterioration is caused by moderate storms of a monthly frequency while intense hurricanes contribute to less than 1% to long term salt marsh erosion rates.

The action of storms and associated wind waves and storm surges can strongly alter both horizontal and vertical salt marsh dynamics in the immediate after-storm period, as well as in the long term, by affecting erosion/ deposition, and sediment import/ export in salt marshes and surrounding areas. Furthermore, storms generate serious flood risks in low-lying and highly populated coastal zones. For these reasons, and especially under a climate change perspective, it is important to understand the reciprocal interaction between storms and salt marshes. This manuscript aims to review progresses made in the understanding of salt marsh-storms interactions, and is organized as follows: we first review storm surges (section 2), and wind waves (section 3) attenuation across salt marshes. In section 4 we focus on the impact of storms on salt marshes morphology, and on the preservation of hurricanes signals into the sedimentary records. Section 5 focuses on the impact of storms on the marsh sediment budget. Section 7 discusses how the interplay between storms occurrence and sea level rise influences salt marsh survival. A set of discussions and conclusions is finally presented.

2. Storm surge attenuation by salt marsh

The effectiveness of storm surge height reduction behind marshes is commonly quantified as the attenuation rate in cm of surge height reduction per km distance that the storm surge has propagated over marshes (e.g. Wamsley et al., 2010). However, mechanistic insights in the various factors that control this attenuation rate are rather fragmentary presented in recent literature, which may be one reason why real life implementations of nature-based flood defences are not as diffuse as engineered solutions (Temmerman et al., 2013). Here in this section, we review the most recent scientific insights.

Although anecdotal evidence of storm surge protection behind large marshes is presented in early reports (e.g. Lovelace, 1994; USACE, 1963), systematic evidence and mechanistic studies only started to accumulate over the past 10 years. In particular major coastal flood disasters caused by the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 and hurricane Katrina along the US Gulf coast in 2005 boosted worldwide scientific and public awareness of the potentially important protective role of mangroves (Danielsen et al., 2005) and salt marshes (Day et al., 2007).

A first important source of empirical evidence comes from studies that analysed the reduction of damage or human deaths as a function of marsh or mangrove width between coastal settlements and the open sea. For example, Costanza et al., 2008, performed an extensive analysis of 34 major hurricanes that hit the US Atlantic and Gulf coasts since 1980, demonstrating that damage to properties was significantly reduced behind marshes, and that a loss of 1 ha of marshes would increase average storm damages by 33000 USD. For mangroves, Das and Vincent, 2009, showed that villages that were hit by a tropical cyclone surge in India experienced significantly lower numbers of deaths when they had wider mangroves between them and the coast.

A second source of empirical evidence, are direct measurements of storm surge height reduction within and behind large marshes. Data reported in the literature are especially from the US Gulf coast (e.g. Lovelace, 1994; McGee et al., 2006; USACE, 1963), which is regularly hit by hurricane storm surges and where wide marshlands of several tens of kilometres exist in the Mississippi delta and in back-barrier tidal lagoons. A rule of thumb, derived from these reports, is that peak surge levels are reduced by on average 1 m for every 14.5 km that the surge has propagated over marshes (i.e. ~6.9 cm/km), with large variations between individual hurricane events as much as from 1 m surge reduction per 4 km of marshland (i.e. 25 cm/km) to only 1 m per 60 km (i.e. ~1.7 cm/km) (based on data compilation by Wamsley et al., 2010). This large variation in empirical data indicates that storm surge propagation and attenuation over marshes is complex and that the effectiveness of surge height reduction largely varies depending on specific storm characteristics, marsh ecosystem properties and larger-scale coastal landscape settings. For a macro-tidal estuarine marsh in the SW Netherlands, Stark et al., 2015, presented a large dataset ranging from regular tides to storm surges, showing that the magnitude of tidal and storm tide attenuation strongly depends on the marsh inundation depth and the dimensions of channels that dissect the marsh landscape. Maximum attenuation rates of up to 5 cm/km were measured over marsh transects with smaller channels and for marsh inundation depths of 0.5-1 m, while attenuation rates decreased for shallower and deeper inundation events, including storm surges. For mangroves in Southern Florida, hurricane surge attenuation rates of 9.4 cm/km have been measured over relatively continuous mangrove forests, and slightly lower rates for mangroves along a river corridor (Krauss et al., 2009).

Hydrodynamic modelling studies are a third line of evidence and important research tools to disentangle the various factors controlling the effectiveness of storm surge height reduction by wetlands. Comparing the rapidly growing number of publications in the past few years, we can generally make a distinction between two main mechanisms that depend on the larger-scale landscape setting: (1) storm surge attenuation within and behind continuous marshes is basically due to *friction* exerted by the marsh vegetation and soil on the landward propagating storm surge (e.g. Sheng et al., 2012); and (2) storm surges propagating through an estuarine or deltaic channel or embayment can be attenuated due to lateral flooding and *water storage* on marshes adjacent to that channel (e.g. Smolders et al., 2015). The frictional effect (1) is called here *within-marsh attenuation* and the water storage effect (2) *along-channel attenuation*. Ultimately both take place in most real cases, as marshes and mangroves are typically dissected by networks of tidal channels, implying that surge propagation along these channels is affected by both frictional and lateral water storage effects (e.g. Stark et al., 2016).

Modelling studies, either for idealized marsh geometries (e.g. Loder et al., 2009; Sheng et al., 2012; Temmerman et al., 2012) or for specific more realistic landscape settings (e.g Resio and Westerink, 2008; Wamsley et al., 2010; Wamsley et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2012), demonstrate that the effectiveness of storm surge attenuation depends on specific properties of (1) the storm forcing (such as storm intensity, duration, forward moving speed, storm track), (2) the marsh ecosystem (such as marsh size and soil elevation, vegetation density and continuity, within-marsh channel dimensions), and (3) larger-scale coastal landscape settings (such as off-shore bathymetry, shoreline shape, open coast, back-barrier, estuarine or deltaic setting, levees or dikes behind marshes, etc.).

In terms of effects of storm characteristics, attenuation rates are generally higher for shallow to moderate storm surge levels and decrease for more extreme storm surges that deeply submerge the marshes, as within-marsh frictional effects on the storm surge attenuation relatively decrease with increasing water depth on the marsh (Lawler et al., 2016; Resio and Westerink, 2008; Sheng et al., 2012; Wamsley et al., 2010). Similarly, marshes with a higher soil elevation are more effective in attenuating higher storm surges (Loder et al., 2009; Smolders et al., 2015; Stark et al., 2016), implying that marshes with a sediment accretion deficit and consequently decreasing surface elevation relative to rising sea level, lose their effectiveness for storm surge protection (Temmerman et al., 2012; Wamsley et al., 2009). The protective function also decreases for storms with a longer duration, as the surge has more time to propagate landward and to fill up the whole marsh area (Resio and Westerink, 2008; Wamsley et al., 2010). Similarly, storm surge attenuation behind wetlands is more effective for storms with a faster forward moving speed (Hu et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2013; Sheng et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2012).

In terms of marsh ecosystem properties, wider marshes, of at least 10 or more kilometres wide, as well as marshes with a higher soil elevation, are more effective in dissipating the surge. Effectiveness of storm surge attenuation also markedly increases with higher ratios of marsh vegetation to open water (Loder et al., 2009; Temmerman et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2012; Hu et al., 2015; Sheng et al., 2012)), implying that patchy patterns of gradual marsh degradation, which are observed in several marshes around the world (e.g. Schepers et al., 2017), lead to loss the storm protection function of marshes (Temmerman et al., 2012). The dimension of the tidal channels also influences surge attenuation; for instance, numerical simulations show that the landward flood propagation through the channels is facilitated with deeper or wider channels, leading to less storm surge height reduction (Stark et al., 2016; Temmerman et al., 2012). Stark et al., 2016 showed for a marsh in the SW Netherlands that the effects of within-marsh channel dimensions, marsh platform elevation and storm surge height can be combined into one parameter predicting variations in attenuation rate from 0 to nearly 25 cm/km, i.e. as a function of the ratio between the water volume that is present at high tide above the marsh platform and the total water volume above the platform and in the channels (Figure 3).

Finally, the precise rates of storm surge attenuation by marshes depend on case-specific larger-scale landscape settings. For example, significant storm surge attenuation by wetlands is simulated for the several tens of kilometres wide marshes in the Mississippi deltaic area (Barbier et al., 2013; Hu et al., 2015; Resio and Westerink, 2008; Wamsley et al., 2010; Wamsley et al., 2009) and wide mangrove systems in Southern Florida (Liu et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2012), while more moderate to limited contribution of marshes to storm surge protection are simulated for marshes along the Chesapeake Bay (Haddad et al., 2016), and back-barrier lagoon systems of Jamaica Bay, New York (Marsooli et al., 2016) and the Delmarva coast (Lawler et al., 2016). For the case of marshes occurring along the funnel shaped Scheldt estuary in the Netherlands and Belgium, simulations show that marshes of the same size but located more upstream are more effective in attenuating storm surges propagating inland along the estuarine channel (Smolders et al., 2015). Man-made structures, in particular coastal defence structures such as levees and dikes behind marshes, may cause the setup of water levels against these structures and hence limit the storm surge attenuating effect of marshes in front of such structures, as shown for example in simulations for the 2005 hurricanes Katrina and Rita in the Mississippi delta (Wamsley et al., 2009). Similarly, for a marsh in the SW Netherlands, (Stark et al., 2016) showed blockage effects and setup of peak surge levels against dikes behind the marsh, and that the marsh width needs to be at least 6-10 km to avoid such blockage effects and to maximize the rate of storm surge attenuation.

Summarizing, we may say that empirical data and modelling studies demonstrate effective storm surge height reduction behind large (at least 10 km wide), high-elevated and continuous marshes with few or small channels, and by marshes located more inland along funnel-shaped estuarine and deltaic channels, especially during moderate storm surges, but less effectively during extreme storms that last for more than a day. The latter implies that solely relying on nature-based flood defences in populated low-lying coastal and estuarine areas might sometimes be not advisable. Instead so-called hybrid approaches, combining conservation and restoration of continuous marshes with engineered defence structures, are increasingly developed and implemented worldwide (Sutton-Grier et al., 2015; Temmerman and Kirwan, 2015; Van Wesenbeeck et al., 2014), e.g. on large scales in the Mississippi delta (CPRA, 2012) and Scheldt estuary in Belgium (Meire et al., 2014). An important argument for such hybrid approaches, is that they are more cost-effective as they do not only provide flood risk mitigation but also other valuable ecosystem services, and marshes and mangroves build up land with rising sea levels, making them self-adaptive defences in face of global change (e.g., Temmerman et al., 2013).

3. Wave energy dissipation by salt marsh

Salt marshes are natural wave energy dampers (e.g. Moeller, 2006; Moeller et al., 2014;

Spencer et al., 2016; Beudin et al., 2017). For shallow water, the dissipation of wave energy is related to the viscous boundary layer friction, permeability, and viscous layer of the seabed (e.g. Le Hir et al., 2000). Over a salt marsh the bed-roughness might be considered as the result of two contributions, i.e., vegetation induced friction, and topographic variations over the marsh surface (Hartnall, 1984; Dijkema, 1987; Pethick, 1992). It is also recognized that wave attenuation is affected by plant characteristics such as geometry, stem density, spatial coverage, and stiffness, and that hydrodynamic conditions such as water depth (figure 4), wave period, and wave height are relevant.

The majority of existing studies schematize vegetation with an array of cylinders having a given diameter, density, height, and stiffness level (e.g. Morison et al., 1950; Darlymple et al., 1984; Fonseca and Cahalan, 1992; Kobayashi et al., 1993). The energy of wind waves passing through a vegetated surface is dissipated by the work done by waves on the vegetation. The time averaged rate of energy dissipation per unit horizontal area caused by vegetation, ε_v can be expressed as (e.g. Darlymple et al., 1984; Beudin et al., 2017):

$$\varepsilon_v = \overline{\int_{-h}^{-h+ah} Fudz}$$

Equation 1

Where h is the water depth, ah is the vegetation height, the overbar represents the time averaging of the dissipation term, F is the horizontal component of the force acting on the vegetation, and u is the horizontal velocity due to wave motion. Furthermore, Luhar et al., 2010, demonstrated that even when the motion is driven by a purely oscillatory flow, a mean current in the direction of wave propagation is generated within the meadow. This current is forced by non-zero wave stress similar to the streaming observed in wave boundary layers, and the current is approximately four times the one predicted by the laminar boundary layer theory. According to Morison et al., 1950, the force, F, can be expressed as the sum of a drag force, and an inertia force; the drag force is proportional to a drag coefficient, and to the square of the horizontal flow velocity, and the inertia force is proportional to an inertia coefficient and to the acceleration of the flow. When the effect of plants flexibility is taken into account, drag and inertia force can be expressed as a function of the velocity difference between the fluid and the plant rather than of the sole flow velocity (e.g. Morison et al., 1950). In case of very stiff plants, the drag component is considered dominant, and the inertial forces can be neglected (Morison et al., 1950; Darlymple et al., 1984).

Standard approaches for the prediction of wave energy attenuation by vegetation, are based on the equation for the conservation of energy where the local flow field is estimated using linear wave theory. The general form of the energy conservation equation can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial E c_g}{\partial x} = \varepsilon_v$$

Equation. 2

Where, E, is the wave energy, and c_g is the group velocity. This approach, while reasonable, might be compromised if the vegetation substantially modifies the flow field. An alternative approach was proposed by Kobayashi et al., 1993, for the submerged vegetation case, for which the problem was formulated by using the continuity and linearized momentum equations for the regions over and within the vegetation canopy.

Field measurements confirm that the dissipation of wind waves increases with increasing relative wave height, i.e. the ratio between wave height and water depth (e.g. Le Hir et al., 2000, Moeller, 2006), and decreasing submergence ratio, i.e. ratio between water depth and plant height (Yang et al., 2012; Augustin et al., 2009; Paul et al., 2012).

Field measurements of wind waves over sand flat to salt marsh cross-shore transects, also showed that wave energy dissipation over salt marshes is significantly higher (up to 82% of the energy is dissipated) then on sand flats (29% dissipation) (Moeller, 1999). While part of the wave damping effect is attributable to the reduction in water depth on the higher elevated marsh platform (relative to the lower elevated tidal flat), the energy dissipation over salt marshes is up to 50 % stronger even under similar water depth conditions, which demonstrates the important role of vegetation in the dissipation process.

Wave damping is also strictly related to the relative motion between fluid and plants, which depends on plants stems flexibility, stems diameter, and stems length. Stems with relatively high stiffness tend to follow an oscillatory swaying movement throughout the wave cycle, while more flexible stems tend to bend in the dominant direction of the orbital flow with a high angle which results in canopy flattening, and loss of flow resistance (whip-like movement) (e.g. Luhar and Nepf, 2016; Mullarney and Henderson, 2010; Paul et al., 2016). The movement can switch from swaying to whip-like as the wave energy increases (for example during storm periods) (e.g. Luhar and Nepf, 2016). Increasing plant flexibility reduces the damping of waves as stems tend to move with the surrounding water (Bouma et al., 2005; Elwany et al., 1995; Riffe et al., 2011), however stiff plants can break if hydrodynamic loads are higher than a critical value (Heuner et al., 2015; Puijalon et al., 2011; Silinski et al., 2015). The dissipative contribution given by flexible plants is low, but their deformed configuration (flattening) under high orbital velocities (≥ 74 cm s^{-1}) helps to stabilize surface sediments (Neumeier and Ciavola, 2004; Peralta et al., 2008). In contrast, more rigid plants can reach breakage (from medium orbital velocities), increase turbulence and sediment scouring around the stems, and cause more erosion due to increased shear stress values (Spencer et al., 2016). Vegetation stems also tend to flatten as the storm progresses, this causes the dissipation of wave energy to decrease, but as suggested by previous work, this flattening might promote the stabilization of the substrate. Paul et al., (2016) tested different artificial vegetation elements to measure drag forces on vegetation under different wave loading. They found that stiffness and dynamic frontal areas (e.g. frontal area resulting from bending) are the main factors determining drag forces, while the still frontal area of plants dominate the force-velocity relationship only for low orbital velocities. In the same experiments as reported by Moeller et al. 2014, Rupprecht et al., 2017, tested the effectiveness of two typical NW European salt marsh grasses (Puccinellia maritima, and Elymus athericus) under simulated storms an no-storms conditions. For their specific field site, they found that under high water levels and long wave periods, within the flexible

Puccinellia canopy the orbital velocity decreased, while for the more rigid stems of Elymus, no significant changes in orbital velocity were found. Conversely, under low water levels, and short wave periods, Elymus reduced near bed velocity more than Puccinellia. As expected, more flexible stems of Puccinellia were able to more easily survive the more severe conditions, while the more stiff Elymus plants were subject to structural damage.

4. Storms impact on salt marsh morphology

In comparison to other wetlands, and from a morphological point of view, salt marshes have been found to be more resistant to the impact of storms; this has been mainly attributed to the increased shear strength conferred to the soil by the presence of root systems which are deeper than in other coastal areas such as freshwater wetlands, and floating marshes (e.g. Morton and Barras, 2011). Fagherazzi, 2014, interpreted the bimodal response of vegetated and unvegetated (e.g. sandy beaches) shorelines in terms of low/ high pass filter, suggesting that from a morphological standpoint vegetated shorelines are very effective in buffering (filtering out) very violent storms without damage, but less effective with moderate storms; vice-versa, unvegetated surfaces efficiently absorb energy from mild weather conditions, but generally collapse under high energy.

The impact of storms on salt marshes can significantly vary depending on both storms and ecosystem properties, and can translate into various geomorphic signatures. Some of these signatures have contrasting effects in relation to the long term resilience of the ecosystem. Apart from erosion and deposition processes, storms can also deform the marsh surface trough subsurface processes, and incision (e.g. Morton and Barras, 2011). This section presents a summary of some of the main geomorphic impacts of storms on salt marsh ecosystems (Figure 5).

4.1 Incision

For salt marshes, ponds generated during storms are generally much smaller and less frequent with respect to brackish and freshwater marsh ponds; they also maintain a more amorphous shape (with no preferential direction) in comparison to the more elongated ponds frequently found in freshwater marshes (e.g. Barras, 2011). These ponds are more easily formed where the terrain is already lower, and strong wind driven currents can erode surface sediments (e.g. Morton et al., 2011). Ponds can then enlarge in time due to subsequent storms, and can also deepen leading to a loss of sediments from the marsh (e.g. Mariotti, 2016). In fact, once the ponds are formed, these can expand even if the rest of the marsh platform is able to keep pace with sea level, and wave action; enlarged ponds can eventually connect to tidal channels (e.g. Mariotti and Fagherazzi, 2013; Schepers et al., 2017).

When a pond is connected to channels, it can recover if its bed is higher than the limit for vegetation growth, or if the deposition rate is larger than the rate of sea level rise. When these conditions are not satisfied, the pond enlarges, becomes susceptible to edge erosion due to internally generated wind waves, and the eroded sediments can get lost through tidal channels (Mariotti and Fagherazzi, 2013). Therefore, depending on the action of biological processes, and sedimentation rates, the formation and enlargement of ponds can be irreversible, or reversible with ponds eventually recovering back to the surrounding marsh platform elevation (e.g. Mariotti and Carr, 2014; Mariotti, 2016).

Plucked marsh features (e.g. Barras et al., 2007) are erosional signatures consisting of irregular scours ranging from around 2 to 20 m which can be found in saline as well as intermediate or freshwater marshes when the mineral matter represents a high percentage of the substrate. Plucked marsh features can occur independently from the elevation with respect to mean sea level, as long as the shear stress is sufficient to incise the areas (e.g. Barras et al., 2007).

4.2 Erosion – surface erosion, and shore erosion

The denudation of the marsh from the vegetation cover (also referred to as root scalping, e.g. Priestas et al., 2015) can affect areas of the order of kilometres, and occurs when currents and waves induced shear stress strips vegetated surfaces. The depth of denudation determines the chances and the rate of recovery of the affected areas. If the eroded areas remain above the permanent submerged location, and the root system is not completely destroyed, the denudated zones can recover during the following growing seasons, otherwise the denuded areas might convert to pond or bare tidal flats (e.g. Hendrickson, 1997). When root scalping occurs near the marsh edges, this can translate into, or enhance the lateral erosion of the marsh banks (e.g. Priestas et al., 2015).

As a consequence of waves generated shear stress, the tidal flats in front of the marsh can deepen which indirectly impacts salt marsh survival, because of an increased depth in front of the marsh can increase wave energy and promote lateral erosion (e.g. Fagherazzi et al., 2006). The erosion depth of the marsh platform can range from a few to several centimetres. For instance, Hendrickson, (1997), reported erosion rates of 6 cm after the occurrence of two hurricanes, Hurricane Erin, and Opal, (1995) for salt marshes in St. Marks River, Florida. However, the erosion of the marsh surface doesn't necessarily correspond to an elevation change as the deformation of the marsh platform trough subsurface processes, like compaction or soil swelling, can play an important role as well.

The lateral erosion of marsh shorelines has been found to be mainly dictated by the action of wind waves (e.g. Schwimmer, 2001; Marani et al., 2011; Leonardi et al., 2016a, b). For freshwater marshes, the lateral erosion taking place during hurricanes can be up to 100s m. For salt marshes, even if wave-induced lateral erosion is in the long term one of the main causes of deterioration, the lateral retreat occurring during hurricanes is relatively low due to the short, and impulsive nature of hurricanes, and violent storms (e.g. Leonardi et al 2016a, b; Figure 6a). Based on a global dataset of salt marsh lateral erosion and wave data, it was found that the yearly retreat rate of marsh shorelines linearly increases with wave energy and a critical threshold in wave energy above which salt marsh erosion drastically accelerates is absent. Such critical threshold is instead more commonly found in sandy environments where erosion drastically increases once the sand dunes are over-washed. While the impact of hurricanes on salt marshes can be very strong, their low frequency and short duration lead to a relatively small effect, contributing only 1% of the erosion in the long term. On the contrary, moderate and frequently occurring storms with a monthly reoccurrence are the most dangerous for salt marsh survival (Leonardi et al., 2016a).

Finally, in regard to lateral shorelines dynamics, the intensity of wind waves has been found to also modify the shape of marsh boundaries. Leonardi and Fagherazzi, (2014, 2015) showed that the interplay between waves intensity and the spatial variability in marsh resistance determines the shape of marsh shorelines, as well as erosion rates predictability. The variability in erosional resistance is due to the presence of natural heterogeneities caused by different soil resistance and by ecological, and biological processes. In case of low wave energy conditions, the presence of a variability in erosional resistance might lead to the unpredictable failure of large marsh portions with respect to average erosion rates, and to rough, and jagged marsh boundary profiles displaying high sinuosity values (e.g. Figure 6b, top panel). High-wave-energy conditions, while overall leading to a faster marsh deterioration, cause a constant and predictable erosion, and a smooth marsh boundary profile. A high occurrence of intense storms significantly smooths the marsh boundary, even if it doesn’t strongly alter average erosion rates (Figure 6b). Finally, salt marshes subject to weak wave energy conditions are the most susceptible to variations in the frequency of extreme events (Leonardi et al., 2014, 2015).

Marsh incision, and marsh erosion are strictly related, and the external agents leading to erosion and incision are frequently the same. While being interconnected, the idea of incision is here kept separated from the one of erosion, as it refers to newly formed features, which are small at the scale of the entire marsh complex, while the erosional mechanisms described above and in figure 5 refer to the deterioration of existing, and relatively well-defined marsh components.

4.3 Deposition

The occurrence of storms and hurricanes can be accompanied by the deposition of large amount of sediments. As an example, Hurricane Rita generated 4-5 m of storm surge, which resulted in a deposit 0.5m thick, and extending 500 m inland (e.g. Williams, 2009).

In a comprehensive set of elevation measurements following the impact of hurricanes at ten sites in the United states, Cahoon (2003, 2006) found deposition rates ranging from a few cm (e.g. 3 cm after Hurricane Emily, 1993, and Gordon, 1994 for salt marshes in North Carolina), up to around 30 cm (e.g. 28, and 20 cm after Hurricane Andrew, 1992, for salt marshes in Bayou Chitigue, and Old Oyster, Louisiana).

Depending on the net direction of sediment transport, deposits may be laid down over the salt marsh surface or translated seaward. Storms may not, therefore, necessarily leave behind distinct depositional units but instead increase the increment of tidal deposition through elevated suspended sediment concentrations and/or flow velocities (Stumpf, 1983), thus enhancing the usual mechanisms of settling during inundations or over-bank spilling in close proximity to creeks or the point of tidal ingress. Indeed, Turner et al. (2006, 2007) suggest that large storms increase the supply of mineral matter from offshore via tidal creeks, and have shown that, for Mississippi River salt marshes, the density of minerogenic sediments in salt marsh cores increases with the occurrence of major hurricanes.

Deposition during storms is readily evidenced where breaching and flooding of the supratidal coastline occurs, e.g. washover deposits or fans. For example, Scileppi and Donnelly (2007) found that washover deposits on the Long Island coast correlate with landfalls of the most intense documented hurricanes, and that periods of increased and decreased landfall incidence can be evidenced in the back-barrier sediment record (e.g. Liu and Fearn, 2000; Donnelly et al., 2001; 2004). Barrier overwashing during storms can also deposit lobes of sand and intermixed shells over back-barrier salt marshes, where shell beds may then be preserved in the sediment record as an archive of storm washover (Ehlers et al., 1993). Extensive washover deposits resulting from storms have also been found in a back-barrier setting along the Chenier Plain of Louisiana where the intensity of recent hurricanes influences the extent and grain size of the deposits (Williams, 2011).

It is less common for salt marshes to preserve depositional evidence of storms, or at least deposits that can readily be distinguished from the usual background of regular tidal deposition or, indeed, other extreme events such as tsunami (cf. Goff et al., 2004; Morton et al., 2007). Goodbred and Hine (1993) recorded the deposition of a tan to grey unit of clays, silt to very fine sand, and marine biogenic matter across Waccasassa Bay salt marshes in Florida following a 3 m storm surge. The deposit was made up of sedimentary material similar to that of the underlying marsh sediments, indicating a local origin. Proximity to tidal ingress had a significant influence on the thickness of the deposit, increasing from a few cm on the salt marsh surface to as much as 12 cm along creek margins. Generally, severe storms have the potential to deposit distinctive sand units that thin and fine in a landward direction over 100s of meters, that have a sharp basal contact with the underlying salt marsh deposits, and that contain marine microfossils (e.g. Morton and Sallenger, 2003; Turner et al., 2006; Williams, 2009). Such anomalous deposits are characterized using several criteria such as the extent of inundation, landward-thinning and/or landward-fining of the deposit, single or multiple particle size grading, and contained microfossil assemblage (Hawkes and Horton, 2012).

Similar, unconformable sand deposits can be found within the salt marsh sediment record of back-barrier estuaries along the Central Coast of California (e.g. Clarke et al., 2014) where their incidence is connected to barrier breaching and inundation during storms. In this case, high frequency variability in the particle size of such deposits in the back-barrier stratigraphy can be associated with ENSO-driven storms, but where the barrier breaching is most likely due to high river flow as opposed to coastal erosion during storms (Clarke et al., 2017).

Drawing on examples from the longer Holocene sediment record, Haggart (1988) examined the stratigraphic and sedimentary evidence of a tidal surge deposit in two open estuary settings in north-eastern Scotland. This micaceous, silty sand was deposited across pre-existing inter-tidal to perimarine environments, which then returned immediately following its deposition. The stratigraphic evidence is therefore indicative of a high energy environment affecting a wide range of coastal environments simultaneously, with a vertical range of 3.5-5.0 m. Detailed dating, particle size, and paleoecological data reveal this deposit to be marine in origin and virtually instantaneous in its deposition. Similar deposits of this kind are found in a number of estuarine and back-barrier settings in north-east Scotland (Smith et al., 2004) for which the timing, rarity, and run-up (as much as 25 m) are indicative of a tsunami rather than a storm surge. Information on storm-related sediment redistribution across the salt marsh surface can equally come from evidence other than stratigraphic, grain size or palaeoecological data. For example, Rahman et al. (2013) explored down-core trends in radioactive pollution to determine patterns of sedimentation in north-west England. A secondary increase in both ^{241}Am and ^{137}Cs activity in the upper 5-10 cm of salt marsh cores from the Dee was interpreted as the re-deposition of sediments eroded from the salt marsh edge, linked to a severe storm in 1990. In principle, the erosion and redistribution of historical pollutants in industrialized estuaries can also be revealed by the analysis of heavy metals or persistent organic pollutants.

In summary, storm deposits are more readily apparent in back-barrier salt marshes where coastal breaching and overwashing enable the landward penetration of coarse sediment lobes that then appear anomalous against the background of tidal mud deposition. Such deposits also have the potential to be found in more open estuary settings where the storm surge results in the landward transport of coarse marine sediment or increases the potential for the redistribution of eroded material onto the salt marsh surface. Identifying such deposits requires a multi-proxy approach to evidence not only the nature and dynamics of the depositional environment but also the age and origin of the sediments, particularly for reconstructing periods of increased and decreased storminess.

4.4 Deformation

Apart from surface processes of erosion, deposition, and incision, subsurface processes induced by soil compaction or groundwater flow are also an important consequence of storms and storm surges occurrence, and can lead to substantial deformation or changes in marsh elevation.

Soil compaction due to sediment layers deposited during storm surges is quite common; water fluxes mainly induced by storm surge events can also cause soil shrinkage or swell. For instance, after hurricane Andrew, 1992, and for salt marshes in Bayou Chitigue, Louisiana, in spite of a 28 cm thick deposit, the total change in elevation was -5cm due to soil compaction (Cahoon, 2006). Similarly, for salt marshes in Cedar Island, North Carolina, the surface erosion due to Hurricane Felix, and Jerry was only -1cm, but the change in elevation due to soil compaction reached -18cm (Cahoon et al., 1999; Cahoon, 2006). According to

Hendrickson, 1997, soil shrinkage caused a 13 cm, and 8 cm lowering of the marsh platform for salt marshes in Florida after Hurricane Opal, 1995 and Erin, 1995 respectively. On the contrary, during Hurricane Alberto, 1994, soil swelling caused by the storm surge increase in water content, caused an increase in elevation of 13 cm for the salt marshes in Florida, (Cahoon, 2006).

5. Storms impact on salt marsh sediment budget

A salt marsh is defined not only through the vegetated marsh plain, but by the entire geomorphic complex. This complex includes the adjacent estuarine/marine seabed, tidal marsh channels, intertidal flats, marsh scarps, the marsh plain, and pools within the marsh plain. Though the salt marsh plain can accrete vertically through organic and inorganic sediment accretion, the geomorphic evolution of the other components is influenced by the inorganic sediment budget (e.g. Ganju et al., 2017).

Sources of sediment for coastal salt marshes are diverse, but can broadly be categorized into external sources, from the erosion of neighbouring coasts or seafloor and from riverine sediment discharge, as well as internal sources from sediment resuspension on intertidal mudflats adjacent to the salt marshes or erosion of the marsh edges and tidal channels (Schuerch et al., 2014). All sources can be highly variable in time and space and are often driven by highly energetic events, such as storms causing severe precipitation, storm surges and/or wave setup (Ma et al., 2014; Schuerch et al., 2016).

The transport of sediments to the salt marsh occurs on multiple timescales. Wind-waves, due to diurnal or stronger episodic winds, can mobilize estuarine and intertidal flat sediments, erode marsh scarps, and increase sediment concentrations in the water column (Fagherazzi and Priestas, 2010; Ganju et al. 2013).

Over large and small spatio-temporal scales, the net sediment budget will govern whether the complex is trending towards expansion or contraction. For example, a sediment transport deficit that results in a deepening of the estuary will allow for greater propagation of wave energy towards the marsh scarp, leading to increased thrust and erosion of the scarp. The sediment liberated from the marsh scarp may then deposit elsewhere in the complex, or it may be exported from the entire system through hydrodynamic processes. Inorganic sediment supply is also important for vertical accretion on marsh plains (Reed 1989), though in some environments marshes can subsist entirely on organic production (Turner et al. 2002). Furthermore, where the marsh plain meets the marsh scarp, there is a more delicate balance that is dependent on sediment supply, and morphological features as well; for instance, Redfield (1972) identifies the tendency for slumped blocks of peat to trap sediment, and reconstitute marsh plain through recolonization by vegetation, thereby leading to no net loss of marsh plain. Mariotti and Canestrelli, 2017 modelled the long term (3000 years) morphodynamic of an idealized tidal basin considering organogenic accretion, and biostabilization; they found that a basin-scale sediment budget is necessary to predict marsh erosion, and that under several conditions, edge erosion, not platform drowning is likely to dominate marsh loss.

Storms can have varying effects on sediment supply: in some cases they lead to massive sediment export from the system (Ganju et al. 2013), substantial sediment import (Rosencranz et al. 2016), significant marsh plain deposition (Goodbred and Hine, 1995), or negligible marsh plain deposition (Elsey-Quirk 2106).

Ganju et al. (2013) identified disparate sediment sources and transport mechanisms at two Chesapeake Bay marsh complexes (one stable, one degraded), i.e., tidal processes delivered sediment to the stable marsh while fall and winter storms exported sediment from the degraded marsh. Conversely, Rosencranz et al. (2016) found that a single 3 day storm delivered enough sediment to counteract two months of tidally driven sediment export within a Pacific coast marsh complex.

For a degraded marsh complex in Blackwater, MD, USA, tidal resuspension and advection did not provide sediments, while sustained northwest wind events with a 2-wk return interval were able to both mobilize sediment from open-water areas and export sediments (Ganju et al., 2013, Figure 7b); the orientation of the open-water area was aligned along the northwest-southeast axis, thereby allowing for greater fetch and wind-wave exposure during northwest winds. The ensuing wind-waves both mobilized subaqueous sediments and eroded marsh edges; export was then caused by a regional hydrodynamic response which led to net water export. However, a nearby stable complex (Fishing Bay, MD, USA, Figure 7a) imported sediment due to tidal resuspension/advection and proximity to an estuarine sediment source. There was minimal sediment export during the same aforementioned wind-wave events, due to a lack of open-water area.

In Barnegat Bay, New Jersey (USA) a strong south-to-north gradient in shoreline type and sediment availability leads to a variable response to storm events. Dinner Creek, in the southern portion of the bay, is bordered by undeveloped marsh shoreline and shoals consisting of fine sediment (Miselis et al. 2016; Ganju et al. 2014), while Reedy Creek is surrounded by hardened shorelines and coarse-sediment dominated shoals. Ganju et al. (2017) reported a net sediment import for Dinner Creek and negligible sediment transport in Reedy Creek; cumulative fluxes in response to wind events indicate a direction-dependent response (Figure 7c, d). Both sites export sediment during periods with northwest winds and import sediment during southerly winds, but Dinner Creek imports sediment during easterly winds while Reedy Creek remains neutral (Figure 7c, d). This differential response is likely due to the availability of sediment in the estuary. These results show that the location of a salt marsh plays a strong role in the sediment dynamics during storm events, with varied directional responses. Tidal asymmetry affects the net import/ export of sediments as well. The distortion of the tidal wave may significantly change under storm conditions, hence converting a system which would normally import sediments into a system which export sediments (Schuerch et al., 2014).

Finally, Ganju et al. (2017) synthesized sediment budgets of eight microtidal salt marsh complexes, and demonstrated a relationship between the sediment budget and the unvegetated-vegetated marsh ratio, indicating that sediment deficits are linked to conversion of vegetated marsh portions to open water. Both observational and modelling efforts provide insight into the influence of storms and extreme events on sediment transport to and from salt marshes.

Storms impact on sea level rise resilience

Accelerated sea level rise is challenging the survival of coastal salt marshes, which may decrease in elevation within the tidal frame and eventually be inundated too frequently to support the growth of salt marsh vegetation (Kearney et al., 1988; Day et al., 2000; Schepers et al., 2017). With increasing rates of sea level rise, coastal salt marshes rely on a higher sediment supply in order to vertically adapt to the rising sea level (French, 1993; Kirwan et al., 2010a; D’Alpaos et al., 2011). Ma et al. (2014), for example, show a decrease in marsh sedimentation rates in the Oosterschelde estuary (NL) after the construction of a storm surge barrier, which markedly reduced the (external) marine sediment delivery, but also show that sedimentation rates are still keeping up with sea level rise due to sediment resuspension on the adjacent intertidal mudflat during storm events.

Although estimates of critical rates of sea level rise for coastal salt marshes around the world indicate a relatively high resilience for many salt marsh sites (Kirwan et al., 2016), all assessments also highlight that the available sediment supply is a key factor for marsh resilience to sea level rise (French, 2006; Kirwan et al., 2010a; D'Alpaos et al., 2011; Schuerch et al., 2013). Furthermore, salt marshes in microtidal regimes were identified as particularly sensitive to a drop in sediment supply under increasing rates of sea level rise, whereas salt marshes in macrotidal regimes are more resilient to high rates of sea level rise and/or reduced sediment supply (Spencer et al., 2016; Kirwan et al., 2010b). While being more susceptible to drowning as a consequence of sea level rise, sedimentation rates on microtidal marshes were also shown to be more responsive to changes in storm activity due to an increase in sediment supply through intertidal sediment resuspension with respect to macrotidal marshes. Kolker et al. (2009), for example, found clear storm signals in the sedimentation records of their microtidal and wave exposed study sites within the Long Island Sound (USA), but a much reduced signal in the neighbouring macrotidal sites.

In this context, elongated periods (decades) of increased storm activity appear as the main driver for sedimentation in excess of local sea level rise rates as shown for a mesotidal salt marsh in the German North Sea (Figure 8; Schuerch et al., 2012). This excess sedimentation significantly contributes to the resilience of the marsh with respect to its vertical performance and its ability to adapt to future SLR (Schuerch et al., 2013). In the Mississippi Delta, extreme events such as the Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 were reported to contribute sediment layers of 9-13 and 7 cm, respectively, which is manifold the regular annual sedimentation (Horton et al., 2009). Meanwhile, Tweel and Turner (2014) argue that the strongest 2% of extreme events contribute 15% of the sedimentation to the marshes of the Mississippi Delta, whereas the majority of the sedimentation (78%) can be attributed to moderate hurricanes with a landfall barometric pressure between 930 and 960 mb (Tweel and Turner, 2014). In addition to sediment deposition, subsurface processes may, however, dominate the elevation response to storm events in many marshes of the Mississippi Delta (Cahoon, 2006; McKee and Cherry, 2009). Subsurface processes are primarily related to soil organic matter, hence are most relevant in organogenic marshes and less so in minerogenic marshes.

Moderate storm events also appear to be responsible for the majority of marsh sedimentation on the Danish peninsula of Skallingen (Bartholdy et al., 2004), where extreme storm events were shown to increase suspended sediment concentrations within the adjacent tidal basin by a factor of up to 20 due to sediment resuspension on the intertidal mudflats. There, a single extreme event could contribute 7.5% to the annual sediment deposition, whereas a single regularly occurring gale already contributes 71% (Bartholdy and Aagard, 2001). The high importance of frequently inundating gale events is in accordance with the modelling study of Schuerch et al. (2013), who suggest that the frequency of storm events is more important for inorganic marsh accretion than their intensity. The explanation for this behaviour is that the frequency distribution of high and extreme water levels decreases exponentially with increasing high water levels (Bartholdy et al., 2004; Schuerch et al., 2013), whereas the sediment resuspension on the intertidal mudflat appears to follow a linear relationship with increasing high water level (Temmerman et al., 2003) or significant wave heights (Fagherazzi and Pristas, 2010). Therefore extreme sediment resuspension events are too rare to make a significant impact. Furthermore, the impact of wave-induced sediment resuspension decreases with increasing water depths during high inundation events (Fagherazzi and Wiberg, 2009; Christiansen et al., 2006).

However, sediment resuspension within the intertidal zone is a highly variable process (Carniello et al., 2016), as it also relies on the sediment composition of the seabed and the presence of benthic biology determining the erosion thresholds and the stability of the seabed (Le Hir et al., 2007; Grabowski et al., 2011). In particular the benthic biological activity (e.g. vegetated seabeds, diatom biofilms, and benthic macrofauna) has the potential to introduce significant spatial and temporal variations in sediment resuspension (Andersen et al., 2001).

Locally, and depending on biological activity, the impact of storm events on the sediment supply of coastal salt marshes may therefore be subject to considerable seasonal variations, often with a stronger impact of storm events on sediment supply during the winter months (Temmerman et al., 2003).

During long periods of increased storm activity, which appear to be most effective in increasing sedimentation rates on salt marshes (Figure 8; Schuerch et al., 2012), intertidal sediment resuspension may cause a lowering of the mudflat elevation and potentially conversion to a subtidal flat. In combination with an enhanced vertical growth of the vegetated marsh platform this may lead to an increased mudflat-salt marsh elevation gradient (Le Hir et al., 2007; Mariotti and Fagherazzi, 2010). Incoming waves, therefore, have an increased erosive impact on the steeper marsh edge, hence increasing the marsh's vulnerability to lateral erosion (e.g. Van de Koppel et al., 2005)). A reduction of the intertidal mudflat area due to storm erosion also reduces the sediment resuspension and therefore the sediment supply for the vertical growth of the salt marsh. Both marsh edge erosion and the vertical performance of coastal salt marshes are therefore critically dependent on external sediment supply, which in fact is often enhanced by storm events as well (Mariotti and Carr, 2014).

The sediment import into the tidal basins of the Wadden Sea (South-eastern North Sea), for example, increases during storm events and the sediment composition shifts into the coarser spectrum as increased erosion takes place along the beaches of the adjacent barrier islands and the ebb-tidal delta (Schuerch et al., 2014). Similarly, increased suspended sediment concentrations are observed along the UK East coast as a consequence of the erosion of soft cliffs, particularly during the winter season and intensified storm periods (McCave, 1987; Nicholls et al., 2000; Dyer and Moffat, 1998). Storm events are also often associated with increased precipitation in the catchments of the rivers draining into the coastal zone. The increased river runoff often increases the sediment delivery into the coastal zone and hence the "external" sediment supply for coastal salt marshes (Schuerch et al., 2016). The relationship between river runoff and sediment delivery is, however, not necessarily a straightforward one as it is subject to intense anthropogenic modifications, such as river damming or land use change in the river catchment (Syvitski et al., 2005).

Despite the abundant field evidence and the well-developed knowledge on the importance of sediment supply for coastal salt marshes, current estimations of future salt marsh development largely neglects the processes and feedbacks involved in storm-related sedimentation by neglecting the temporal variations in sediment supply and assuming a constant sediment supply throughout the coming century (e.g. Kirwan et al., 2010; D'Alpaos et al., 2011; Mariotti and Carr, 2014). Accounting for the storm-induced variability in sediment supply for coastal salt marshes in future models is particularly important as storm activity is known to be subject to significant decadal variability (e.g. driven by the North-Atlantic Oscillation) and may prevent or facilitate the collapse of coastal salt marshes, when conventional modelling under the assumption of constant sediment supply and storm activity would predict differently.

Discussion and Conclusions

In face of climate change, the continued delivery of salt marsh ecosystem services, such as mitigation of flood risks, erosion risks, and carbon sequestration, is increasingly important.

Under storm conditions salt marshes are able to effectively dissipate both high water levels and wave energy even under extreme water level conditions, but their energy dissipation action decreases with increasing water level. Empirical data and modelling studies demonstrate effective storm surge height reduction behind large and continuous marshes, but also point at limitations in the storm surge protection value, when marshes are smaller, and intersected by large channels or open water areas.

The presence of vegetation, and the decrease in water level on the marsh platform both contribute to wave and surge dissipation. Vegetation properties largely influence this dissipation process; while the more flexible stems tend to flatten during powerful storms (with a reduction in dissipation potential), they are also the more resilient to structural damage, and their flattening helps to protect the marsh substrate against erosion. On the other hand, with increasing wave energy, high vegetation stiffness can enhance the turbulence and surface erosion around plant stems.

Results highlight that there are significant evidences that natural infrastructures such as salt marsh ecosystems, have the potential to enhance coastal resilience. Indeed, in recent years there have been several examples of coastal projects involving natural defences; for instance, in the UK many coastal communities are following manged realignment approaches moving built defences back away from the shoreline to allow natural infrastructures to develop in front of them as a protection (e.g. van Slobbe et al., 2013). In the USA, after hurricane Sandy, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been leading the competition *Rebuild by Design*, which concluded in June 2014 with six winning proposals planning significant hybrid (combined natural, and built defences) components to protect shorelines. Similarly, a project called *PlanNYC* has been developed in New York City for the possible implementation of hybrid coastal protection services (e.g. Sutton-Grier, 2015). Large challenges exist in the identification of best coastal protection options, and there are strengths and weaknesses connected to engineered, as well as natural or hybrid infrastructures (Figure 9). For instance, there is a significant expertise in the design and implementation of built infrastructures, but these provide no co-benefits, can cause habitat losses, and tend to weaken during their life-time. On the other hand, natural infrastructures provide many co-benefits (e.g. carbon sequestration, recreational activities, tourism opportunities), they can strengthen rather than weaken during their lifetime, and possibly adapt to sea level rise; however, they are frequently not ready to be immediately used for coastal protection after their implementation due to the time required for ecosystems establishments, and require large areas to be implemented. Hybrid approaches have the potential to capitalize on best characteristics of both built and natural infrastructures, but can still have some negative impact on the ecosystems with respect to fully natural solutions, and do not provide the same level of co-benefits. We suggest that ideally, coastal protection schemes should rely on a combination of conservation and restoration of large continuous marsh areas when possible, and hybrid solutions where necessary.

Storm action can have various impacts on the geomorphological evolution of salt marshes, and different implications for their long term survival to sea level rise, and climate change in general. Storms impact potentially causes erosion of marsh boundaries, marsh platforms, and surrounding tidal flats, but it might also deliver substantial amount of sediments to the marsh platform.

According to the IPCC (Meehl et al., 2007), it is likely that there will be an increase in peak wind intensities, and near storm precipitations in future cyclones, with an increased occurrence of violent storms in spite of the likely decrease in the total number of storm. Under these assumptions, it could be argued that marsh boundaries are expected to be only slightly influenced by such changes during immediate after-storm periods; this is because it has been shown that the lateral erosion of salt marshes is mostly dictated by average weather conditions rather than by the most intense storms. On the other hand, the biggest impact that storms could have in relation to lateral salt marsh dynamics could instead be connected to the deepening of tidal flats which promotes higher wave energy at the marsh boundary, and reduces wave energy dissipation by bottom friction, causing therefore an increase in the erosion potential during inter-storms period, i.e. under normal weather conditions.

The impact on the vertical salt marsh dynamic is complicated because, even if more intense storms have the potential to deposit more sediments, there are evidences about the fact that storms frequency is more important than intensity for the long term inorganic accretion of salt marshes. The explanation for this behaviour is that the frequency of very high and extreme water levels decreases exponentially with increasing levels, and in the long term large but sporadically occurring sediment deposits might deliver less sediments than relatively small but more frequently occurring deposits (Schuerch et al., 2013, 2014).

The occurrence of storms might then directly or indirectly impact the sediment budget of the coastline. In particular, the direction of storm events can determine whether there is a direct import or export from a coastal embayment. Furthermore, the occurrence of storms is generally connected to precipitation events and surface runoff which might increase the transport of sediments from the catchment to the coastline (e.g. Ganju et al., 2013)

The latter considerations highlight the necessity to focus on the indirect impact that large storms might exert on salt marshes not only in the immediate after storm period, but also in the longer term, and on how their morphological consequences influence the response of the system to normal weather conditions during inter-storm periods. Some of the challenges highlighted from the complexity of the problem also include the necessity to consider salt marsh systems as a whole by adopting an integrated approach, taking into account the marsh tidal flat continuum and by accounting for various sediment sources.

Figures

Figure 1

Percentage changes in Emmanuel's (1995) wind maximum potential intensity (MPI_V) per degree increase in global surface air temperature. Large values of MPIv values are generally associate to enhanced tropical storms activity, and intensity (adapted from Vecchi and Soden, 2007).

Figure 2

Sketch of mechanisms and sediment fluxes possibly responsible for salt marsh vertical and horizontal dynamics. Black dashed box represents an hypothetical control volume for the evaluation of the sediment budget.

Figure 3

Relationship between the attenuation rate of High Water Levels (dHWL/dx) at least 0.4m above the marsh platform, and α_V, i.e. ratio between the over-marsh water volume (Vpl) and the total water volume (Vpl+Vc, i.e. over-marsh water volume + water volume within channels) (adapted from Stark et al., 2016).

Figure 4

Sketch of three different flow regimes, i.e. no vegetation, submerged vegetation, emergent vegetation; different flow profiles, and different sources of turbulence within the flow are present depending on vegetation height with respect to water depth. The dominant source of turbulence is respectively (from left to right) the bed, the top of the canopy (shear layer), and the stem wakes. Figure slightly adapted from Beudin et al., 2017. The figure refer to the development of a coupled wave-flow-vegetation interaction model in COAWST (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2016.12.010).

Figure 5

Diagram representative for some of the major storms impacts on salt marsh morphology, their spatial scale, and useful literature references. Morton and Barras, 2011; b) Mariotti and Carr, 2014; c) Mariotti, 2016; d) Fan et al., 2006; e) Scileppi and Donnelly, 2007; f) Williams, 2009; g) Leonardi et al., 2016a,b; h) Leonardi et al., 2014, 2015; i) Barras, 2007, l) Cahoon, 2006; m) Cahoon, 2003; These impact are mainly categorized into the following: Deformation, Erosion, Deposition, and Incision.

Figure 6

A) Contribution of different wind categories to salt marsh erosion (from Leonardi et al., 2016). B) Impact of increasing extreme events frequency on the shape of marsh shorelines (adapted from Leonardi et al., 2014, 2015). Increasing the occurrence of extreme events smooths the marsh shoreline.

Figure 7

Sediment flux response to wind forcing at four wetland complexes, as a function of wind direction (radial position) and speed (outward position). The wind direction indicates direction the wind is coming from. Fishing Bay and Blackwater (Maryland, USA), are adjacent to Chesapeake Bay, but their respective locations relative to sediment sources and external forcing result in disparate sediment transport responses to wind events. Northwest winds export sediment from both sites, but southerly winds allow for sediment import at Fishing Bay due to proximity to a southern sediment source (Ganju et al., 2013). Dinner and Reedy Creeks, in southern and northern Barnegat Bay (New Jersey, USA), respectively, both export sediment during westerly winds, but Dinner Creek imports sediment during strong easterly winds. This is likely due to increased fine sediment availability and undeveloped shoreline in the southern portion of Barnegat Bay, as opposed to coarser sediments and hardened shoreline in northern Barnegat Bay.

Figure 8

(a) Historic marsh elevations in comparison to the development of the mean high water level (MHW) and the mean sea level (MSL) for three cores (S1: high marsh; S2: low marsh; S3: pioneer marsh) from a salt marsh on the German island of Sylt (in the South-eastern North Sea). Deposition dates were derived from ^{210}Pb and ^{137} Cs data (open diamonds).(b) Comparison of sedimentation rates (stars) at core location S2 with storm frequency (open circles), defined as the number of water levels exceeding 2.4 m above the long-term mean sea level (NN: German ordnance datum). Modified after Schuerch et al. (2012). The green shaded area indicates the periods of excess sedimentation during periods of increased storm activity.

Figure 9 Example of possible Built defences (a), natural defences (b), hybrid defences (c), and some of their strengths and weakness. Figure, and table content adapted from Sutton-Grier et al., 2015 (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.04.006).

Acknowledgments

The following funding are acknowledged: USGS Federal award No G16AC00455; NERC NE/N015614/1.

References

Andersen, T.J., 2001. Seasonal Variation in Erodibility of Two Temperate, Microtidal Mudflats. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 53(1), 1-12.

Augustin, L.N., Irish, J.L., Lynett, P., 2009. Laboratory and numerical studies of wave damping by emergent and near-emergent wetland vegetation. Coastal Engineering 56, 332–340.

Bacmeister, J.T., Reed, K.A., Hannay, C., Lawrence, P., Bates, S., Truesdale, J.E., Rosenbloom, N. and Levy, M., 2016. Projected changes in tropical cyclone activity under future warming scenarios using a high-resolution climate model. *Climatic Change*, pp.1-14.

Barbier, E. B., Georgiou, I. Y., Enchelmeyer, B., and Reed, D. J., 2013, The Value of Wetlands in Protecting Southeast Louisiana from Hurricane Storm Surges Plos One, v. 8, p. e58715.

Barras, J.A., 2007. *Satellite images and aerial photographs of the effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on coastal Louisiana* (No. 281). Geological Survey (US).

Bartholdy, J. and Aagaard, T., 2001. Storm surge effects on a back-barrier tidal flat of the Danish Wadden Sea. Geo-Marine Letters, 20(3), 133-141.

Bartholdy, J., Christiansen, C. and Kunzendorf, H., 2004. Long term variations in backbarrier salt marsh deposition on the Skallingen peninsula - the Danish Wadden Sea. Marine Geology, 203(1-2), 1-21.

Beudin, A., Kalra, T.S., Ganju, N.K. and Warner, J.C., 2017. Development of a coupled wave-flow-vegetation interaction model. *Computers & Geosciences*, *100*, pp.76-86.

Bouma, T. J., De Vries, M. B., Low, E., Peralta, G., Tanczos, I., Van de Koppel, J., and Herman, P. M. J., 2005, Trade-offs related to ecosystem-engineering: a case study on stiffness of emerging macrophytes: Ecology, v. 86, p. 2187-2199.

Cahoon, D.R., Day Jr, J.W. and Reed, D.J., 1999. The influence of surface and shallow subsurface soil processes on wetland elevation: A synthesis. *Current topics in wetland biogeochemistry*, *3*, pp.72-88.

Cahoon, D. R. 2003. Storms as agents of wetland elevation change: their impact on surface and subsurface sediment processes, Proceedings of the International Conference on Coastal Sediments 2003. May 18-23, 2003, Clearwater Beach, FL, USA. CD-ROM Published by World Scientific Publishing Corp. and East Meets West Productions, Corpus Christi, Texas, USA. ISBN 981-238-422-7.

Cahoon, D.R., 2006. A review of major storm impacts on coastal wetland elevations. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *29*(6), pp.889-898.

Carniello, L., D'Alpaos, A., Botter, G. and Rinaldo, A.C.J.F., 2016. Statistical characterization of spatiotemporal sediment dynamics in the Venice lagoon. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 121(5), 1049-1064.

Cheong, S. M., Silliman, B., Wong, P. P., van Wesenbeeck, B., Kim, C. K., and Guannel, G., 2013, Coastal adaptation with ecological engineering: Nature Climate Change, v. 3, no. 9, p. 787-791.

Christiansen, T., Wiberg, P.L. and Milligan, T.G., 2000. Flow and sediment transport on a tidal salt marsh surface. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *50*(3), pp.315-331.

Christiansen, C., Vølund, G., Lund-Hansen, L.C. and Bartholdy, J., 2006. Wind influence on tidal flat sediment dynamics: Field investigations in the Ho Bugt, Danish Wadden Sea. Marine Geology, 235(1-4), 75-86.

Clarke, D. W., Boyle, J. F., Plater, A. J. (2017). Particle-size evidence of barrier estuary regime as a new proxy for ENSO climate variability. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, in press. doi:10.1002/esp.4106

Clarke, D. W., Boyle, J. F., Chiverrell, R. C., Lario, J., Plater, A. J. (2014). A sediment record of barrier estuary behaviour at the mesoscale: Interpreting high-resolution particle size analysis. Geomorphology 221, 51-68.

Costanza, R., Perez-Maqueo, O., Martinez, M. L., Sutton, P., Anderson, S. J., and Mulder, K., 2008, The value of coastal wetlands for hurricane protection: Ambio, v. 37, no. 4, p. 241-248.

CPRA, 2012, Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast: Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority.

D'Alpaos, A., Mudd, S.M. and Carniello, L., 2011. Dynamic response of marshes to perturbations in suspended sediment concentrations and rates of relative sea level rise. Journal of Geophysical Research-Earth Surface, 116(F4), F04020.

D'Alpaos, A. and Marani, M., 2016. Reading the signatures of biologic–geomorphic feedbacks in salt-marsh landscapes. *Advances in Water Resources*, *93*, pp.265-275.

Danielsen, F., Sorensen, K., Olwig, M. F., Selvam, V., Parish, F., Burgess, N. D., Hiraishi, T., Karunagaran, F. M., Rasmussen, M. S., Hansen, L. B., Quarto, A., and Suryadiputra, N., 2005, The Asian Tsunami: a protective role for coastal vegetation: Science, v. 310, p. 643-643.

Day, J., Britsch, L., Hawes, S., Shaffer, G., Reed, D. and Cahoon, D., 2000. Pattern and process of land loss in the Mississippi Delta: A Spatial and temporal analysis of wetland habitat change. Estuaries and Coasts, 23(4), 425-438.

Das, S., and Vincent, J. R., 2009, Mangroves protected villages and reduced death toll during Indian super cyclone: Proceedings of the National Academy of Scieces of the United States of America, v. 106, p. 7357-7360.

Day, J. W., Boesch, D. F., Clairain, E. J., Kemp, G. P., Laska, S. B., Mitsch, W. J., Orth, K., Mashriqui, H., Reed, D. J., Shabman, L., Simenstad, C. A., Streever, B. J., Twilley, R. R., Watson, C. C., Wells, J. T., and Whigham, D. F., 2007, Restoration of the Mississippi delta: lessons from hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Science, v. 315, p. 1679-1684.

Deegan, L. A., Johnson, D. S., Warren, R. S., Peterson, B. J., Fleeger, J. W., Fagherazzi, S., and Wollheim, W. M., 2012, Coastal eutrophication as a driver of salt marsh loss: Nature, v. 490, p. 388-392.

de Groot, A.V., Veeneklaas, R.M. and Bakker, J.P., 2011. Sand in the salt marsh: Contribution of high-energy conditions to salt-marsh accretion. Marine Geology, 282(3-4), 240-254.

Dyer, K.R. and Moffat, T.J., 1998. Fluxes of suspended matter in the East Anglian plume Southern North Sea. Continental Shelf Research, 18(11), 1311-1331.

Dijkema, K.S., 1987. Geography of salt marshes in Europe. Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie N.F. 31 (4), 489-499.

Donnelly, J. P., Roll, S., Wengren, M., Butler, J., Webb III, T. (2001) Sedimentary evidence of intense hurricane strikes from New Jersey. Geology 29, 615–618.

Donnelly, J. P., Butler, J., Roll, S., Wengren, M., Webb III, T. (2004) A backbarrier overwash record of intense storms from Brigantine, New Jersey. Marine Geology 210, 107–121.

Ehlers, J., Nagorny, K., Schmidt, P., Stieve, B., Zietlow, K. (1993) Storm Surge Deposits in North Sea Salt Marshes Dated by 134Cs and 137Cs Determination. Journal of Coastal Research 9(3), 698-701.

Elsey-Quirk, T., 2016. Impact of Hurricane Sandy on salt marshes of New jersey. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *183*, pp.235-248.

Elwany, M., W. O'Reilly, R. Guza, and R. Flick (1995), Effects of Southern California kelp beds on waves, J. Waterw. Port Coastal Ocean Eng.,121(2), 143–150.

Fan, D., Guo, Y., Wang, P. and Shi, J.Z., 2006. Cross-shore variations in morphodynamic processes of an open-coast mudflat in the Changjiang Delta, China: with an emphasis on storm impacts. *Continental Shelf Research*, *26*(4), pp.517-538.

Fagherazzi, S., Carniello, L., D'Alpaos, L. and Defina, A., 2006. Critical bifurcation of shallow microtidal landforms in tidal flats and salt marshes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 103(22), pp.8337-8341.

Fagherazzi, S. and Wiberg, P.L., 2009. Importance of wind conditions, fetch, and water levels on wave-generated shear stresses in shallow intertidal basins. Journal of Geophysical Research, 114(F3), F03022.

Fagherazzi, S. and Priestas, A.M., 2010. Sediments and water fluxes in a muddy coastline: interplay between waves and tidal channel hydrodynamics. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 35(3), 284-293.

Fagherazzi, S., 2013. The ephemeral life of a salt marsh. Geology, 41(8), pp.943-944.

Fagherazzi, S., 2014. Coastal processes: Storm-proofing with marshes. *Nature Geoscience*, *7*(10), p.701.

Foster, N.M., Hudson, M.D., Bray, S. and Nicholls, R.J., 2013. Intertidal mudflat and saltmarsh conservation and sustainable use in the UK: A review. *Journal of environmental management*, *126*, pp.96-104.

French, J.R., 1993. Numerical simulation of vertical marsh growth and adjustment to accelerated sea-level rise, North Norfolk, U.K. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 18(1), 63-81.

French, J., 2006. Tidal marsh sedimentation and resilience to environmental change: Exploratory modelling of tidal, sea-level and sediment supply forcing in predominantly allochthonous systems. Marine Geology, 235(1-4), 119-136.

Ganju, N.K., Defne, Z., Kirwan, M.L., Fagherazzi, S., D'alpaos, A. and Carniello, L., 2017. Spatially integrative metrics reveal hidden vulnerability of microtidal salt marshes. *Nature communications*, *8*.

Ganju, N.K., Miselis, J.L. and Aretxabaleta, A.L., 2014. Physical and biogeochemical controls on light attenuation in a eutrophic, back-barrier estuary. *Biogeosciences*, *11*, pp.7193-7205.

Ganju, N.K., Nidzieko, N.J. and Kirwan, M.L., 2013. Inferring tidal wetland stability from channel sediment fluxes: Observations and a conceptual model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *118*(4), pp.2045-2058.

Ganju, N.K., Schoellhamer, D.H. and Bergamaschi, B.A., 2005. Suspended sediment fluxes in a tidal wetland: Measurement, controlling factors, and error analysis. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *28*(6), pp.812-822.

Goff, J., McFadgen, B.G., Chagué-Goff, C. (2004) Sedimentary differences between the 2002 Easter storm and the 15th-century Okoropunga tsunami, southeastern North Island, New Zealand Marine Geology 204(1–2), 235-250.

Goodbred, S.L. and Hine, A.C., 1995. Coastal storm deposition: Salt-marsh response to a severe extratropical storm, March 1993, west-central Florida. *Geology*, *23*(8), pp.679-682.

Goodbred Jr, S.L., Wright, E.E. and Hine, A.C., 1998. Sea-level change and storm-surge deposition in a late Holocene Florida salt marsh. Journal of Sedimentary Research, 68(2).

Grabowski, R.C., Droppo, I.G. and Wharton, G., 2011. Erodibility of cohesive sediment: The importance of sediment properties. Earth-Science Reviews, 105(3-4), 101-120.

Grinsted, A., Moore, J. C., and Jevrejeva, S., 2013, Projected Atlantic hurricane surge threat from rising temperatures: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, v. 110, no. 14, p. 5369-5373.

Haddad, J., Lawler, S., and Ferreira, C. M., 2016, Assessing the relevance of wetlands for storm surge protection: a coupled hydrodynamic and geospatial framework: Natural Hazards, v. 80, no. 2, p. 839-861.

Haggart, B.A. (1988) The stratigraphy, depositional environment and dating of a possible tidal surge deposit in the Beauly Firth area, northeast Scotland. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 66(3), 215-230.

Hawkes, A.D., Horton, B.P. (2012) Sedimentary record of storm deposits from Hurricane Ike, Galveston and San Luis Islands, Texas, Geomorphology doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.05.017

Heuner, M., Silinski, A., Schoelynck, J., Bouma, T.J., Puijalon, S., Troch, P., Fuchs, E., Schroder, B., Schroder, U., Meire, P., Temmerman, S., 2015. Ecosystem engineering by plants on wave-exposed intertidal flats is governed by relationships between effect and response traits. PLoS One 10, e0138086, http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138086http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138086.

Hartnall, T.J., 1984. Salt-marsh vegetation and micro-relief development on the New Marsh at Gibraltar Point, Lincolnshire. In: Clark, M.W. (Ed.), Coastal Research: UK Perspectives. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 37-58, 131 pp.

Hendrickson, J.C., 1997. *Coastal wetland response to rising sea-level: quantification of short-and long-term accretion and subsidence, northeastern Gulf of Mexico*.

Horton, B.P., Rossi, V. and Hawkes, A.D., 2009. The sedimentary record of the 2005 hurricane season from the Mississippi and Alabama coastlines. Quaternary International, 195(1-2), 15-30.

Hu, K. L., Chen, Q., and Wang, H. Q., 2015, A numerical study of vegetation impact on reducing storm surge by wetlands in a semi-enclosed estuary: Coastal Engineering, v. 95, p. 66-76.

Jiang, P., Yu, Z., Gautam, M.R., Yuan, F. and Acharya, K., 2016. Changes of storm properties in the United States: observations and multimodel ensemble projections. *Global and Planetary Change*, *142*, pp.41-52.

Kearney, M.S., Grace, R.E. and Stevenson, J.C., 1988. Marsh Loss in Nanticoke Estuary, Chesapeake Bay. Geographical Review, 78(2), 205-220.

Kirwan, M.L., Guntenspergen, G.R., D'Alpaos, A., Morris, J.T., Mudd, S.M. and Temmerman, S., 2010a. Limits on the adaptability of coastal marshes to rising sea level. Geophysical Research Letters, 37(23), L23401.

Kirwan, M.L. and Guntenspergen, G.R., 2010b. Influence of tidal range on the stability of coastal marshland. Geophysical Research Letters, 115(F2), F02009.

Kirwan, M.L., Murray, A.B., Donnelly, J.P. and Corbett, D.R., 2011. Rapid wetland expansion during European settlement and its implication for marsh survival under modern sediment delivery rates. *Geology*, *39*(5), pp.507-510.

Kirwan, M.L. and Mudd, S.M., 2012. Response of salt-marsh carbon accumulation to climate change. *Nature*, *489*(7417), p.550.

Kirwan, M.L., Temmerman, S., Skeehan, E.E., Guntenspergen, G.R. and Fagherazzi, S., 2016. Overestimation of marsh vulnerability to sea level rise. Nature Clim. Change, 6(3), 253-260.

Kolker, A.S., Goodbred Jr, S.L., Hameed, S. and Cochran, J.K., 2009. High-resolution records of the response of coastal wetland systems to long-term and short-term sea-level variability. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 84(4), 493-508.

Kobayashi, N., Raichle, A.W. and Asano, T., 1993. Wave attenuation by vegetation. *Journal of waterway, port, coastal, and ocean engineering*, *119*(1), pp.30-48.

Koch, E.W. and Gust, G., 1999. Water flow in tide-and wave-dominated beds of the seagrass Thalassia testudinum. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *184*, pp.63-72.

Krauss, K. W., Doyle, T. W., Doyle, T. J., Swarzenski, C. M., From, A. S., Day, R. H., and Conner, W. H., 2009, Water level observations in mangrove swamps during two hurricanes in Florida: Wetlands, v. 29, no. 1, p. 142-149.

Lawler, S., Haddad, J., and Ferreira, C. M., 2016, Sensitivity considerations and the impact of spatial scaling for storm surge modeling in wetlands of the Mid-Atlantic region: Ocean & Coastal Management, v. 134, p. 226-238.

Lee, M., 2001. Coastal defence and the Habitats Directive: predictions of habitat change in England and Wales. *The Geographical Journal*, *167*(1), pp.39-56.

Le Hir, P., Monbet, Y. and Orvain, F., 2007. Sediment erodability in sediment transport modelling: Can we account for biota effects? Continental Shelf Research, 27(8), 1116-1142.

Leonard, L.A., Hine, A.C., Luther, M.E., Stumpf, R.P. and Wright, E.E., 1995. Sediment transport processes in a west-central Florida open marine marsh tidal creek; the role of tides and extra-tropical storms. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *41*(2), pp.225-248.

Le Hir, P., Roberts, W., Cazaillet, O., Christie, M., Bassoullet, P., Bacher, C., 2000. Characterization of intertidal flat hydrodynamics. Continental Shelf Research 20, 1433-1459.

Leonardi, N. and Fagherazzi, S., 2014. How waves shape salt marshes. *Geology*, *42*(10), pp.887-890.

Leonardi, N. and Fagherazzi, S., 2015. Effect of local variability in erosional resistance on large-scale morphodynamic response of salt marshes to wind waves and extreme events. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *42*(14), pp.5872-5879.

Leonardi, N., Ganju, N.K. and Fagherazzi, S., 2016a. A linear relationship between wave power and erosion determines salt-marsh resilience to violent storms and hurricanes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(1), pp.64-68.

Leonardi, N., Defne, Z., Ganju, N.K. and Fagherazzi, S., 2016b. Salt marsh erosion rates and boundary features in a shallow Bay. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *121*(10), pp.1861-1875.

Liu, K., Fearn, M.L. (2000) Reconstruction of prehistoric landfall frequencies of catastrophic hurricanes in northwestern Florida from lake sediment records. Quaternary Research 54, 238–245.

Liu, Y., Weisberg, R.H., Vignudelli, S., Roblou, L. and Merz, C.R., 2012. Comparison of the X-TRACK altimetry estimated currents with moored ADCP and HF radar observations on the West Florida Shelf. Advances in Space Research, 50(8), pp.1085-1098.

Liu, H. Q., Zhang, K. Q., Li, Y. P., and Xie, L., 2013, Numerical study of the sensitivity of mangroves in reducing storm surge and flooding to hurricane characteristics in southern Florida: Continental Shelf Research, v. 64, p. 51-65.

Loder, N. M., Irish, J. L., Cialone, M. A., and Wamsley, T. V., 2009, Sensitivity of hurricane surge to morphological parameters of coastal wetlands: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 84, no. 4, p. 625-636.

Lovelace, J. K., 1994, Storm-tide elevations produced by Hurricane Andrew along the Louisiana coast, August 25-27, 1992, Open File Report 94-371.

Luhar, M., Nepf, H.M., 2016. Wave-induced dynamics of flexible blades. J. Fluid Struct. 61, 20–41.

Luhar, M., Coutu, S., Infantes, E., Fox, S. and Nepf, H., 2010. Wave-induced velocities inside a model seagrass bed. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *115*(C12).

Ma, Z., Ysebaert, T., van der Wal, D., de Jong, D.J., Li, X. and Herman, P.M.J., 2014. Long-term salt marsh vertical accretion in a tidal bay with reduced sediment supply. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 146, 14-23.

Marani, M., d'Alpaos, A., Lanzoni, S. and Santalucia, M., 2011. Understanding and predicting wave erosion of marsh edges. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *38*(21).

Mariotti, G. and Fagherazzi, S., 2010. A numerical model for the coupled long-term evolution of salt marshes and tidal flats. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *115*(F1).

Mariotti, G. and Fagherazzi, S., 2013. Critical width of tidal flats triggers marsh collapse in the absence of sea-level rise. *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, *110*(14), pp.5353-5356.

Mariotti, G. and Carr, J., 2014. Dual role of salt marsh retreat: Long-term loss and short-term resilience. *Water Resources Research, 50*(4), pp.2963-2974.

Mariotti, G., 2016. Revisiting salt marsh resilience to sea level rise: Are ponds responsible for permanent land loss?. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *121*(7), pp.1391-1407.

Mariotti, G. and Canestrelli, A., Long-term morphodynamics of muddy backbarrier basins: Fill in or empty out?. Water Resources Research. DOI: 10.1002/2017WR020461

Marsooli, R., Orton, P. M., Georgas, N., and Blumberg, A. F., 2016, Three-dimensional hydrodynamic modeling of coastal flood mitigation by wetlands: Coastal Engineering, v. 111, p. 83-94.

McGee, B. D., Goree, B. B., Tollet, R. W., Woodward, B. K., and Kress, W. H., 2006, Hurricane Rita surge data, Southwestern Louisiana and Southeastern Texas, September-November 2005: US Geological Survey.

McCave, I.N., 1987. Fine sediment sources and sinks around the East Anglian Coast (UK). Journal of the Geological Society, 144(1), 149-152.

McKee, K.L. and Cherry, J.A., 2009. Hurricane Katrina sediment slowed elevation loss in subsiding brackish marshes of the Mississippi River delta. Wetlands, 29(1), 2-15.

Meire, P., Dauwe, W., Maris, T., Peeters, P., Coen, L., Deschamps, M., Rutten, J., and Temmerman, S., 2014, Sigma plan proves efficiency: ECSA Bulletin, v. 62, p. 19-23.

Meehl, G.A., T.F. Stocker, W.D. Collins, P. Friedlingstein, A.T. Gaye, J.M. Gregory, A. Kitoh, R. Knutti, J.M. Murphy, A. Noda, S.C.B. Raper, I.G. Watterson, A.J. Weaver and Z.-C. Zhao, 2007: Global Climate Projections. In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Mendez, F. J., and I. J. Losada (2004), An empirical model to estimate the propagation of random breaking and non-breaking waves over vegetation fields, Coastal Eng. , 51, 103–118, doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2003.11.003.

Miselis, J.L., Andrews, B.D., Nicholson, R.S., Defne, Z., Ganju, N.K. and Navoy, A., 2016. Evolution of mid-Atlantic coastal and back-barrier estuary environments in response to a hurricane: Implications for barrier-estuary connectivity. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *39*(4), pp.916-934.

Möller, I., T. Spencer, J.R. French, D.J. Leggett, and M. Dixon (1999), Wave transformation over salt marshes: a field and numerical modelling study from North Norfolk, England. Estuarine Coastal Shelf Science 49: 411–426.

Moller I. 2006. Quantifying saltmarsh vegetation and its effect on wave height dissipation: results from a UK east coast saltmarsh. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 69:337–51.

Möller, I., Kudella, M., Rupprecht, F., Spencer, T., Paul, M., Van Wesenbeeck, B.K., Wolters, G., Jensen, K., Bouma, T.J., Miranda-Lange, M. and Schimmels, S., 2014. Wave attenuation over coastal salt marshes under storm surge conditions. *Nature Geoscience*, *7*(10), pp.727-731.

Morton, R.A., Sallenger, A.H., 2003. Morphological impacts of extreme storms on sandy beaches and barriers. Journal of Coastal Research 19, 560–573.

Morton, R.A., Gelfenbaum, G., Jaffe, B.E. (2007) Physical criteria for distinguishing sandy tsunami and storm deposits using modern examples. Sedimentary Geology 200 (3–4), 184-207

Morton, R.A. and Barras, J.A., 2011. Hurricane impacts on coastal wetlands: A half-century record of storm-generated features from southern Louisiana. *Journal of Coastal Research*, *27*(6A), pp.27-43.

Mudd, S.M., Howell, S.M. and Morris, J.T., 2009. Impact of dynamic feedbacks between sedimentation, sea-level rise, and biomass production on near-surface marsh stratigraphy and carbon accumulation. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, *82*(3), pp.377-389.

Mullarney, J.C., Henderson, S.M. (2010), Wave-forced motion of submerged single-stem vegetation, J. Geophys. Res., 115, C12061, doi:10.1029/2010JC006448.

Murray, A.L. and Spencer, T., 1997. On the wisdom of calculating annual material budgets in tidal wetlands. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *150*, pp.207-216.

Nicholls, R.J., Dredge, A. and Wilson, T., 2000. Shoreline change and fine-grained sediment input: Isle of Sheppey Coast, Thames Estuary, UK. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 175(1), 305-315.

Neumeier, U., Ciavola, P., 2004. Flow resistance and associated sedimentary processes in a Spartina maritima salt-marsh. J. Coast. Res. 20, 435–447.

Paul, M., Bouma, T.J., Amos, C.L., 2012. Wave attenuation by submerged vegetation: combining the effect of organism traits and tidal current. Marine Ecology-Progress Series 444, 31–41.

Paul, M., Rupprecht, F., Möller, I., Bouma, T.J., Spencer, T., Kudella, M., Wolters, G., van Wesenbeeck, B.K., Jensen, K., Miranda-Lange, M., Schimmels, S., 2016. Plant stiffness and biomass as drivers for drag forces under extreme wave loading: a flume study on mimics. Coast. Eng. 117, 70–78.

Pachauri, R.K., Allen, M.R., Barros, V.R., Broome, J., Cramer, W., Christ, R., Church, J.A., Clarke, L., Dahe, Q., Dasgupta, P. and Dubash, N.K., 2014. *Climate change 2014: synthesis report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (p. 151). IPCC.

Pendleton, L., Donato, D.C., Murray, B.C., Crooks, S., Jenkins, W.A., Sifleet, S., Craft, C., Fourqurean, J.W., Kauffman, J.B., Marbà, N. and Megonigal, P., 2012. Estimating global "blue carbon" emissions from conversion and degradation of vegetated coastal ecosystems. PloS one, 7(9), p.e43542.

Peralta, G., van Duren, L.A., Morris, E.P., Bouma, T.J., 2008. Consequences of shoot density and stiffness for ecosystem engineering by benthic macrophytes in flow dominated areas: a hydrodynamic flume study. Mar. Ecol.—Prog. Ser. 368, 103–115.

Pethick, J.S., 1992. Saltmarsh geomorphology. In: Allen, J.R.L., Pye, K. (Eds.), Saltmarshes. Morphodynamics, Conservation and Engineering Significance. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 41-62.

Puijalon, S., Bouma, T.J., Douady, C.J., van Groenendael, J., Anten, N.P.R., Martel, E., Bornette, G., 2011. Plant resistance to mechanical stress: evidence of an avoidance-tolerance trade-off. New Phytolologist, 191, pp. 1141–1149.

Priestas, A.M., Mariotti, G., Leonardi, N. and Fagherazzi, S., 2015. Coupled wave energy and erosion dynamics along a salt marsh boundary, Hog Island Bay, Virginia, USA. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, *3*(3), pp.1041-1065.

Rahman, R., Plater, A. J., Nolan, P. J., Mauz, B., Appleby, P. G. (2013). Potential health risks from radioactive contamination of saltmarshes in NW England. Journal of Environmental Radioactivity 119, 55-62.

Redfield, A.C., 1972. Development of a New England salt marsh. *Ecological monographs*, *42*(2), pp.201-237.

Reed, D.J., 1989. Patterns of sediment deposition in subsiding coastal salt marshes, Terrebonne Bay, Louisiana: the role of winter storms. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *12*(4), pp.222-227.

Reed, D.J., 2002. Understanding tidal marsh sedimentation in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. *California. Journal of Coastal Research Special*, (36), pp.605-611.

Resio, D. T., and Westerink, J. J., 2008, Modelling the physics of storm surges: Physics Today, v. 61, no. 9, p. 33-38.

Riffe, K. C., S. M. Henderson, and J. C. Mullarney (2011), Wave dissipation by flexible vegetation, Geophysical Research Letters, 38,p. L18607, doi:10.1029/2011GL048773.

Rosencranz, J.A., Ganju, N.K., Ambrose, R.F., Brosnahan, S.M., Dickhudt, P.J., Guntenspergen, G.R., MacDonald, G.M., Takekawa, J.Y. and Thorne, K.M., 2016. Balanced Sediment Fluxes in Southern California’s Mediterranean-Climate Zone Salt Marshes. Estuaries and Coasts, 39(4), pp.1035-1049.

Rupprecht, F., Moller, I., Evans, B., Spencer, T., and Jensen, K., 2015, Biophysical properties of salt marsh c anopies Quantifying plant stern flexibility and above ground biomass: Coastal Engineering, v. 100, p. 48-57.

Rupprecht, F., Möller, I., Paul, M., Kudella, M., Spencer, T., van Wesenbeeck, B. K., ... & Schimmels, S. (2017). Vegetation-wave interactions in salt marshes under storm surge conditions. Ecological Engineering, 100, 301-315.

Schepers, L., Kirwan, M. L., Guntenspergen, G. R., and Temmerman, S., 2017, Spatio-temporal development of vegetation die-off in a submerging coastal marsh: Limnology and Oceanography, v. 62, p. 137-150.

Schuerch, M., Rapaglia, J., Liebetrau, V., Vafeidis, A. and Reise, K., 2012. Salt Marsh Accretion and Storm Tide Variation: an Example from a Barrier Island in the North Sea. Estuaries and Coasts, 35(2), 486-500.

Schuerch, M., Vafeidis, A., Slawig, T. and Temmerman, S., 2013. Modeling the influence of changing storm patterns on the ability of a salt marsh to keep pace with sea level rise. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 118(1), 84-96.

Schuerch, M., Dolch, T., Reise, K. and Vafeidis, A.T., 2014. Unravelling interactions between salt marsh evolution and sedimentary processes in the Wadden Sea (southeastern North Sea). Progress in Physical Geography, 38(6), 691-715.

Schuerch, M., Scholten, J., Carretero, S., García-Rodríguez, F., Kumbier, K., Baechtiger, M. and Liebetrau, V., 2016. The effect of long-term and decadal climate and hydrology variations on estuarine marsh dynamics: An identifying case study from the Río de la Plata. Geomorphology, 269, 122-132.

Schwimmer, R.A., 2001. Rates and processes of marsh shoreline erosion in Rehoboth Bay, Delaware, USA. *Journal of Coastal Research*, pp.672-683.

Scileppi, E. and Donnelly, J.P., 2007. Sedimentary evidence of hurricane strikes in western Long Island, New York. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 8*(6).

Scileppi, E., Donnelly, J.P. (2007) Sedimentary evidence of hurricane strikes in western Long Island, New York. Geochemistry, Geophysics and Geosystems 8(6), Q06011, doi:10.1029/2006GC001463

Sheng, Y. P., Lapetina, A., and Ma, G. F., 2012, The reduction of storm surge by vegetation canopies: Three-dimensional simulations: Geophysical Research Letters, v. 39.

Silinski, A., Heuner, M., Schoelynck, J., Puijalon, S., Schroder, U., Fuchs, E., Troch, P., Bouma, T.J., Meire, P., Temmerman, S., 2015. Effects of wind waves versus ship waves on tidal marsh plants: a flume study on different life stages of Scirpus maritimus. PLoS One 10, e0118687, http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.ponehttp://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone. 0118687.

Smith, D.E., Shi, S., Cullingford, R.A., Dawson, A.G., Dawson, S., Firth, C.R., Foster, I.D.L., Fretwell, P.T., Haggart, B.A. Holloway, L.K., Long, D. (2004) The Holocene Storegga Slide tsunami in the United Kingdom Quaternary Science Reviews 23(23–24), 2291-2321.

Smolders, S., Plancke, Y., Ides, S., Meire, P., and Temmerman, S., 2015, Role of intertidal wetlands for tidal and storm tide attenuation along a confined estuary: a model study: Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, v. 15, p. 1659–1675.

Sobel, A.H., Held, I.M. and Bretherton, C.S., 2002. The ENSO signal in tropical tropospheric temperature. *Journal of Climate*, *15*(18), pp.2702-2706.

Spencer, T., Brooks, S.M., Evans, B.R., Tempest, J.A. and Möller, I., 2015. Southern North Sea storm surge event of 5 December 2013: water levels, waves and coastal impacts. *Earth-Science Reviews*, *146*, pp.120-145.

Spencer, T., Moller, I., Rupprecht, F., Bouma, T.J., van Wesenbeeck, B.K., Kudella, M., Paul, M., Jensen, K., Wolters, G., Miranda-Lange, M., Schimmels, S., 2016. Salt marsh surface survives true-to-scale simulated storm surges. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms. DOI:10.1002/esp.3867.

Spencer, T., Schuerch, M., Nicholls, R.J., Hinkel, J., Lincke, D., Vafeidis, A.T., Reef, R., McFadden, L. and Brown, S., 2016. Global coastal wetland change under sea-level rise and related stresses: The DIVA Wetland Change Model. Global and Planetary Change, 139, 15-30.

Stark, J., Plancke, Y., Ides, S., Meire, P., and Temmerman, S., 2016, Coastal flood protection by a combined nature-based and engineering approach: modeling the effects of marsh geometry and surrounding dikes: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 175, p. 34-45.

Stark, J., Van Oyen, T., Meire, P., and Temmerman, S., 2015, Observations of tidal and storm surge attenuation in a large tidal marsh: Limnology and Oceanography, v. 60, no. 4, p. 1371-1381.

Stevenson, J.C., Kearney, M.S. and Pendleton, E.C., 1985. Sedimentation and erosion in a Chesapeake Bay brackish marsh system. *Marine Geology*, *67*(3-4), pp.213-235.

Stumpf, R.P. (1983) The process of sedimentation on the surface of a salt marsh. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 17(5), 495-508.

Sutton-Grier, A. E., Wowk, K., and Bamford, H., 2015, Future of our coasts: The potential for natural and hybrid infrastructure to enhance the resilience of our coastal communities, economies and ecosystems: Environmental Science & Policy, v. 51, p. 137-148.

Syvitski, J.P.M., Vörösmarty, C.J., Kettner, A.J. and Green, P., 2005. Impact of Humans on the Flux of Terrestrial Sediment to the Global Coastal Ocean. Science, 308(5720), 376-380.

Temmerman, S., Govers, G., Meire, P. and Wartel, S., 2003. Modelling long-term tidal marsh growth under changing tidal conditions and suspended sediment concentrations, Scheldt estuary, Belgium. Marine Geology, 193(1-2), 151-169.

Temmerman, S. et al. Ecosystem-based coastal defence in the face of global change. Nature 504, 79–83 (2013).

Temmerman, S., De Vries, M. B., and Bouma, T. J., 2012, Coastal marsh die-off and reduced attenuation of coastal floods: a model analysis: Global and Planetary Change, v. 92-93, p. 267-274.

Temmerman, S., and Kirwan, M. L., 2015, Building land with a rising sea: Science, v. 349, no. 6248, p. 588-589.

Temmerman, S., Meire, P., Bouma, T. J., Herman, P. M. J., Ysebaert, T., and De Vriend, H. J., 2013, Ecosystem-based coastal defence in the face of global change: Nature, v. 504, p. 79-83.

Tonelli, M., Fagherazzi, S. and Petti, M., 2010. Modeling wave impact on salt marsh boundaries. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *115*(C9).

Turner, R.E., Baustian, J.J., Swenson, E.M., Spicer, J.S. (2006) Wetland sedimentation from hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Science 314, 449–452.

Turner, R.E., Swenson, E.M., Milan, C.S., Lee J.M. (2007) Hurricane signals in salt marsh sediments: Inorganic sources and soil volume. Limnology and Oceanography 52(3), 1231–1238.

Tweel, A.W. and Turner, R.E., 2014. Contribution of tropical cyclones to the sediment budget for coastal wetlands in Louisiana, USA. Landscape Ecology, 29(6), 1083-1094.

USACE, 1963, Interim survey report, Morgan city, Louisiana and vicinity, serial no. 63: US Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans.

Van de Koppel, J., Van der Wal, D., Bakker, J. P., and Herman, P. M. J., 2005, Self-organisation and vegetation collapse in salt marsh ecosystems: The American Naturalist, v. 165, no. 1, p. E1-E12.

Van Slobbe, E., de Vriend, H.J., Aarninkhof, S., Lulofs, K., de Vries, M. and Dircke, P., 2013. Building with Nature: in search of resilient storm surge protection strategies. Natural hazards, 66(3), pp.1461-1480.

Van Wesenbeeck, B., Mulder, J. P. M., Marchand, M., Reed, D. J., De Vries, M. B., De Vriend, H. J., and Herman, P. M. J., 2014, Damming deltas: a practice of the past? Towards nature-based flood defenses: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 140, p. 1-6.

Vecchi, G.A. and Soden, B.J., 2007. Increased tropical Atlantic wind shear in model projections of global warming. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *34*(8).

Wamsley, T. V., Cialone, M. A., Smith, J. M., Atkinson, J. H., and Rosati, J. D., 2010, The potential of wetlands in reducing storm surge: Ocean Engineering, v. 37, no. 1, p. 59-68.

Wamsley, T. V., Cialone, M. A., Smith, J. M., Ebersole, B. A., and Grzegorzewski, A. S., 2009, Influence of landscape restoration and degradation on storm surge and waves in southern Louisiana: Natural Hazards, v. 51, p. 207-224.

Webster, P.J., Holland, G.J., Curry, J.A. and Chang, H.R., 2005. Changes in tropical cyclone number, duration, and intensity in a warming environment. *Science*, *309*(5742), pp.1844-1846.

Williams, H.F., 2009. Stratigraphy, sedimentology, and microfossil content of Hurricane Rita storm surge deposits in southwest Louisiana. *Journal of Coastal Research*, pp.1041-1051.

Williams, H.F.L. (2011). Stratigraphic Record of Hurricanes Audrey, Rita and Ike in the Chenier Plain of Southwest Louisiana. Journal of Coastal Research SI 64, 1921-1926.

Woodruff, J. D., Irish, J. L., and Camargo, S. J., 2013, Coastal flooding by tropical cyclones and sea-level rise: Nature, v. 504, p. 44-52.

Woth, K., Weisse, R. and Von Storch, H., 2006. Climate change and North Sea storm surge extremes: an ensemble study of storm surge extremes expected in a changed climate projected by four different regional climate models. *Ocean Dynamics*, *56*(1), pp.3-15.

Yang, S.L., Shi, B.W., Bouma, T.J., Ysebaert, T., Luo, X.X., 2012. Wave attenuation at a salt marsh margin: a case study of an exposed coast on the Yangtze Estuary. Estuaries Coasts 35, 169– 182.

Zhang, K., Douglas, B.C. and Leatherman, S.P., 2000. Twentieth-century storm activity along the US east coast. *Journal of Climate*, *13*(10), pp.1748-1761.

Zhang, K. Q., Liu, H. Q., Li, Y. P., Xu, H. Z., Shen, J., Rhome, J., and Smith, T. J., 2012, The role of mangroves in attenuating storm surges: Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, v. 102, p. 11-23.

Figure 1


30°N
20°N
10°N
0°
10°S
20°S
30°S
50°E
150°E
110°W
10°W
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0.25
−0.25
−1
−2
−3
−4
−5
−6
−7
Percent Change per °C Global Warming
0.10
0.20
0.15
0.05
0.40
0.35

Figure 2



Sediment deposition on marsh platform
Sediment transport on marsh platform during high tide/ high water level
aboveground and belowground biomass
riverine sediment inputs
mean high tide
wind waves
Salt marsh
mean sea level
Sediment resuspension due to waves and tidal currents
mean low tide
Marsh edge erosion or progradation, sediments delivered to the tidal flat
tidal flat
Sediment import/ export trough the control volume
Sediment import/ export trough the control volume

Figure 3



dHWL/dx = -36.2 * α_v + 8.0
r^2 = 0.921
p < 0.001
S1-S2
S2-S3
S3-S4
S4-S5
Y1-Y2
Y2-Y3
Y3-Y4
Y4-Y5
Y5-Y6
dHWL/dx [cm/km]
5
0
-5
-10
-15
-20
-25
-30
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
$\alpha_v = V_{pl} / (V_{pl} + V_{ch})$

Figure 4


Boundary layer flow
Submerged canopy flow
Emergent canopy flow
U(z)
eddies
generated
at the bed
overlying flow
shear layer
canopy
stem wakes
stem wakes

Figure 5



Impact storms on salt marsh morphology
Deformation
Erosion
Deposition
Incision
compaction (a, I, l, m)
water flux shrink/ swell (a, I, l, m)
rootmat folding (a, I, l, m)
marsh platform erosion
Shore erosion
erosion marsh surface and denudation (a, i)
pond expansion (b, c)
tidal flat deepening (d, l)
lateral bank Erosion (g, h)
wrack zones (a)
interior deposits (a, e, f, l)
shoreline deposits a, e, f, l)
new amorphous ponds (a, i)
plucked marsh (a, i)

Figure 6


A
Contribution to marsh erosion of different wind categories
1% (± 0.2%)
4.0% (± 1.9%)
5.0% (± 3.0 %)
5.0%(± 2.7%)
7.0 % (± 2.5 %)
24.0% (± 5.7 %)
36.0% (± 8.3%)
18.0% (± 3.0%)
Calm
Light Air
Light Breeze
Gentle Breeze
Moderate Breeze
Fresh Breeze
Strong Breeze
Near Gale
Gale
Strong Gale
Storm
Violent Storm
Hurricane
B
Impact of extreme events on marsh shoreline shape
marsh
sea
Increase frequency extreme events

Figure 7

Click here to download high resolution image



Figure 8



a)
S1
S2
MHW
S3
MSL
Meters above NN
1.5
1
0.5
0
1920
1940
1960
1980
2000
b)
Sedimentation rate
Storm frequency
Eustatic SLR
ß=0.86
Sedimentation rate (mm/year)
Numbers of storms per year
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0
1940
1960
1980
2000

Figure 9

A



Built defences

strengths

- Ready to withstand storm events as soon as constructed
- Significant expertise, experience, and good state of knowledge on their implementation and functioning

weaknesses

- Does not adapt with changing conditions (e.g. sea level)
- Possible coastal habitat losses
- False sense of security, possibly causing increased damages during storms
- Only provides storm protection benefits, no co-benefits

B



Natural defences

strengths

- Provides many-co-benefits
- Potential to self-recover after storms
- Can be cheaper
- Potential to adapt changing conditions, and grow stronger in time

weaknesses

- Can take long time before ecosystem is established and ready to provide adequate defence
- Likely require large space
- Growing but still limited expertise in their implementation
- Variable levels of coastal protection depending of the ecosystem, and external forcing, which is possibly difficult to quantify/

C



Hybrid defences

strengths

- Provides some co-benefits
- Can provide greater level confidence than natural solutions alone
- Can be used in areas with smaller space than the required for natural solutions alone
- Capitalize best characteristics of built and natural infrastructures

weaknesses

- Growing but still limited expertise in their implementation
- Does not provide same benefits than natural systems alone
- Can still have some negative impact on the ecosystem